



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:


- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



Per. 3977e. $\frac{199}{39}$



THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

VOL. XXXIX.

PUBLISHED IN
SEPTEMBER AND DECEMBER, 1855.



LONDON:
THOMAS RICHARDSON AND SON,
147, STRAND; 9, CAPEL STREET, DUBLIN; AND DERBY.
MARSH & BEATTIE, EDINBURGH; HUGH MARGEY, GLASGOW.
NEW YORK: EDWARD DUNIGAN AND BROTHER, 151, FULTON STREET.
PARIS: 22, RUE DE LA BANQUE, STASSIN AND XAVIER.

—
1855.

CONTENTS OF No. LXXVII.

ART.	PAGE.
I.—1. Audin's Life of Luther. Translated by W. B. Turnbull. London: Dolman, 1853.	
2. Gosselin's Power of the Popes. Translated by the Rev. M. Kelley. London: Dolman, 1852.	
3. A Succinct account of Luther and his Writings. By Dr. Doellinger. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.	1
II.—Food and its Adulterations, comprising the Reports of the Analytical Sanitary Commission of the Lancet. By Arthur Hill Hassall, M.D. London; Longmans, 1855.	60
III.—Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to El Medinah and Meccah. By Richard F. Burton. 8vo. Vols. I. and II. London: Longmans, 1855,	76
IV.—Clément XIII. et Clément XIV., Par le Père de Ravignan, De la Compagnie de Jésus. Paris: Julien. Lanier et Cie. 1854,	109
V.—1. The Tablet, 1855.	
2. The Weekly Register, for August 1855.	146
VI.—Allocuzione della Sanctita di Nostro Signore Pio PP. IX. Al sacro Collegio vel Consistoro Segreto dei 22. Gennago 1855. Seguita da una Esposizione Corredata di documenti sulle incessanti Cure della Stessa Santita Sua a Riparo dei Gravi mali da cui e afflitta la Chiesa Cattolica nel Regno di Sardegna. Roma, 1855.	164

CONTENTS.

ART.		PAGE
VII.	Jashar, Fragmenta archetypa carminum Hebraicorum in Masorethico Veteris Testamenti textu passim tessellata; collegit, ordinavit, restituit, in unum corpus redegit, Latine exhibuit, commentario instruxit Joannes Guilelmus Donaldson, S.T.D., Collegii SS. Trinitatis apud Cantabrigienses olim socius.	
	Jashar, Original Fragments of Hebrew Poems, interwoven with many parts of the Masoretic text of the Old Testament. Collected, put in order, restored, united into one body, translated into Latin, and commented on, by John William Donaldson, D.D., and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 1 vol. 8vo. London: Williams and Norgate. Berlin: Hertz. Printed in the latter place. 199	199
VIII.	A Memoir of the Reverend Sidney Smith, by his Daughter, Lady Holland, With a selection from his Letters, edited by Mrs. Austin. 2 vols. London: Longman, 1855. 244	244

CONTENTS OF No. LXXVIII.

ART.	PAGE.
<p>I.—Memoirs of the Life, Writings, and Discoveries of Sir Isaac Newton. By Sir David Brewster, K. H. &c. 2 vols. Edinburgh: Constable and Co. 1855,</p>	273
<p>II.—Thom's Statistics of Great Britain and Ireland, 1855. Selected from Thom's Irish Almanack and Official Directory. Dublin, Alexander Thom and Sons, 1855,</p>	290
<p>III.—1. Evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons on Juvenile Crime.</p> <p>2. Mettray. A Lecture read before the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society, by Robert Hall, M.A., Recorder of Doncaster. W. and F. G. Cash.</p> <p>3. Letters of the Lord Abbot of St. Bernard's as to Establishment of a Reformatory School,</p>	312
<p>IV.—1. The History of England. By John Lingard, D. D. Fifth Edition. (vol. iii.) 10 vols. 8vo. London: Dolman, 1849.</p> <p>2. Foss' Judges of England, vols. iii. and iv. London: Longmans,</p>	328
<p>V.—1. Christianity and Mankind, their Beginnings and Prospects. By Christian Charles Josias Bunsen, D. D., D. C. L. 7 vols. 8vo. London, Longmans, 1854.</p> <p>2. Hippolytus und Kallistus, von J. Dollinger. 8vo., Regensburg, 1853.</p> <p>3. Die Theologischen Streitigkeiten in der Römischen Kirche in der ersten Hälfte des dritten Jahrhunderts, (Theologische Quartalschrift. Drittes Quartalheft.) Tübingen, 1855,</p>	348
<p>VI.—1. Allocutio Sanctissimi Domini Nostri Pii PP. IX. Allocution of His Holiness Pius IX., in the Consistory of November 3, 1855.</p>	

CONTENTS.

ART.	PAGE
2. Lingard. Observations on the Laws and Ordinances of Foreign States, published in 1817. (Now printed with his Tracts.)	413
VII.—1. Traité de la Prédication, à l'usage des Séminaires. Par un ancien Supérieur de Séminaire. (M. Hamon.) Troisième édition, 8vo. Paris, Lecoffre et Cie. 1854.	
2. Précis de Rhétorique Sacrée à l'usage des Séminaires. Par J. B. Van Hemel, Chanoine Honoraire d'Amiens, et de Malines, Vicaire Général de son Eminence le Cardinal Sterckx, Archevêque de Malines. 8vo. Bruxelles, C. J. Fonteyn, 1855,	433
VIII.—1. The obstacles which have retarded Moral and Political Progress. A Lecture by the Right Hon. Lord John Russell, M. P. London: Nisbet and Co.	
2. On the nature of an Inaugural Discourse. An Introductory Lecture addressed to the St. James's Young Men's Society. By His Eminence Cardinal Wiseman. London: Richardson and Son, ...	462
IX.—1. Christian Theism: the Testimony of Reason and Revelation to the Existence and Character of the Supreme Being. By Robert Anchor Thompson, M. A. London: Rivingtons, Waterloo Place. 1855.	
2. Theism: the Witness of Reason and Nature to an All-Wise and Beneficent Creator. By the Rev. John Tulloch, D.D. William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London. 1855, ...	482



THE DUBLIN REVIEW.

SEPTEMBER, 1853.

- ART. I.—1. *Audin's Life of Luther.* Translated by W. L. ...
London: Dolman, 1853.
2. *Gosselin's Power of the Popes.* Translated by the Rev. H. ...
London: Dolman, 1852.
3. *A Succinct Account of Luther and his Writings.* By Dr. ...
London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.

THERE is a very general impression that the Reformation arose through abuses in the Church. This should be the Protestant notion of the Reformation, and one should expect to find it in Ranke. The former of these writers, speaking of the causes of the Reformation, says: "Among the abuses enumerated the misconduct of Alexander VI.; the usurpations and encroachments of the Pope on the rights of the laity, and the venality of the Roman Court." And the other of them says, "The ambition of temporal princes to ecclesiastical power, the secular ambition in the Popes; the corruption of religious institutions elicited the development of an intellectual tendency, until the very basis of the faith became shaken in public opinion." At the commencement of this latter period, as we approach towards the truth, the general opinion is both historians, and we need hardly

Guizot, or even Schlegel, is that the Reformation was the result of, and the reaction from, abuses in the Church. If this idea were correct, if it embodied not only "the truth," but "the whole truth," and "nothing but the truth," it would go far of course to create a strong impression that the "Reformation" was indeed a *Reformation*. As the essence of the Reformation however was a revolt from Papal authority, it could only be vindicated by identifying the alleged abuses with the Holy See, and producing an impression that the Holy See was responsible for them. And such is the pervading impression among Protestants. Nor is this all. It prevails to a considerable extent even among Catholics of a certain class. Thus there are Catholics who profess that the objections of Churches not in communion with the See of Rome when enquired into, are found to be objections not to the fundamental doctrines of that Church, but to the practice in former times of the Court of Rome, and to its constitution even at the present time;—objections to the election of unworthy Pontiffs; the intrigues against Popes who meditated reforms; the acquisition of great wealth; the corruption occasioned by cupidity; the evil counsels that have led to Pontifical interference in the affairs of princes; to anathemas, interdicts, warfare, and bloodshed; the desolation of Italy and the estrangement of nations formerly in amity and communion with the Holy See. It may be true, they admit, that these evils are exaggerated; but there is still enough, they think, in the history of the Court of Rome, and something more than might be wished even in its constitution as it exists now, which furnish objections it would be well to remove. And it is not difficult to perceive that the only way of "removing" them in the mind of such writers is, to remove what they term the "Court of Rome," or the temporal power and possessions of the See of Rome. Such sentiments show that the question does not merely relate to the past, but to the present, and has a deep practical importance as regards the feelings of veneration and affectionate loyalty which good Catholics love to cherish for the Holy See. Yet, it would not be difficult to find, even in the pages of these Protestant writers themselves, testimonies tending strongly to invalidate the position they seek to establish, and to awaken *a priori*, in a candid mind, some suspicion that after all it is not tenable. For Roscoe and Ranke alike bear witness that, for a long time

anterior to the Reformation the Holy See had lost power among the nations, and they do not deny that this must chiefly be ascribed, nor can they conceal facts showing clearly that it is wholly to be ascribed, to the encroachments of the temporal power upon the spiritual, and the corrupting influences exerted, owing to the interference of princes in the affairs of the Church. And it is rather unfair to ascribe to the Holy See abuses which its enemies introduced, and of all power to correct which it had been by royal oppression deprived.

Yet, that such was the case history plainly shows, and even the historians who impeach the Papacy sufficiently attest. Legislation, like the statutes of provisors, and of *præmunire* in England, and the "Pragmatic Sanction" in France, had for ages deprived the Holy See, in a great degree, of its proper control over the patronage of the Church. And even princes most attached to the Holy See, had long lost the spirit of loyal and implicit obedience to its authority. To quote one instance from among innumerable ones that might be adduced. Muratori, quoted by Ranke, says that "Lorenzo de Medici followed the contumacious license of the greater kings and princes against the Roman Church, allowing nothing of the pontifical rights but as he saw good."* And this is only cited as one striking authority to establish the general statement of the historian, that a universal tendency to the circumscription of Papal power was at this time manifested throughout Christendom in the south as in the north. It will not do to say that this was the result of Papal "corruptions, or a reaction from Papal encroachments;" for these very historians, and others more recent, and equally Protestant, establish that, with exceptions, whichever they admit to be rare, and which researches of Catholic historians are daily showing to be rarer still, even if they exist at all, the Popes were not open to the charge of corruption, and that, as regards their contests with temporal princes, they were, without *any* exception, in the *right*. On this subject the great work of Gosselin is invaluable. He says this is the opinion formed of the investiture question, not only by Catholic writers, but by Protestants, whose profound studies have led them to

* Ranke's Hist. Popes, vol. i. p. 31. *in notes*.

judge the Popes of the Middle Ages with a moderation unfortunately not always found in certain Catholic authors. "We have already," he says, "cited the testimony of Voigt, in his history of Gregory VII., and Hurter's, in his history of Innocent II., is not less remarkable." "It was in these first struggles of the Popes," he observes, "to defend their independence in all things pertaining to the government of the Church, that Christianity found its preservation from the tyranny of the temporal power, and its rescue from becoming a mere state religion among the pagans."* And speaking of the struggles of the Popes as to their temporal possessions, he says, "In the opinion of an eminent Protestant Jurisconsult of the last century, all the Popes can be vindicated by the same arguments." "Good reason is there for asserting," observes Senchenberg, "that there is not in history *a single* example of a pope acting against sovereigns who were content with their own rights, and did not think of exceeding others."† It is established on Protestant testimony, that long before the Reformation, the Popes, who had never wrongfully encroached upon the temporal power, had been, by the wrongful aggressors of that power, deprived of their ancient influence in the affairs of the Church. In a general view this amply suffices to show that the theory which ascribes the Reformation to vices in the Church, is ever, if it be not false in fact, fallacious in reasoning,—for it requires to be proved, in order to burden the Holy See with the responsibility for abuses, (assuming them for the present to have existed to the extent alleged, which we do not admit,) that the Holy See had the power to prevent them; instead of which it is always assumed against it that their alleged existence is sufficient to criminate it, and to show that the "corruptions" in the Church arose from the corruptions in the Holy See! The current of Catholic literature is now, and has been for some time, tending at least upon the continent to vindicate the characters of Christ's Vicars; and the object of many of the most earnest and elaborate papers in this Journal has been simply to show that the historians who most violently impeach the character of Pontiffs, were in most cases the retainers of those princes, who, having plundered the Papacy, were

* Gosselin, v. ii. p. 349. in notes. † Gosselin, v. ii. p. 337, in notes

the most deeply interested in the abasement of the Pontiffs whom they had made victims of their ambition. Now the greatest Catholic and Protestant writers attest the truth of that argument. Thus, Gosselin says, "All the ambition of the Popes was devoted to one object, the maintenance of the liberty of Rome, and of Italy against the emperors of Germany, who frequently revived the most unjust pretensions on that matter. 'To me it appears evident,' observes Voltaire himself, 'that the real cause of the quarrel between the Popes and the Emperors was, that the Popes and *the Romans* did not wish to have an emperor at Rome,' i.e. adds Count de Maistre, 'they did not wish to have a master in their own house.' 'It appears evident,' Voltaire continues, 'that the great design of Frederick II. was to establish in Italy the throne of the new Cæsars; it is perfectly certain that he wished to reign over Italy without control, and without partition. This is the secret spring of all his quarrels with the Popes. Religion was never the cause of the divisions between Frederick and the Holy See.'"^{*} How unjust were the attempts at aggression on the Holy See by the German Emperors, will appear from the fact that they owed their very title to the Holy See. Gosselin establishes that Charlemagne owed the imperial title to the Pope alone, and that when conferring that title the Pope never intended to surrender the right of election in future,†—that the translation of the empire to the Germans was by the authority of the Pope;‡ and that after this, though the Pope did not directly elect the emperor, he long continued to have a great influence on the election.|| "The most ancient monuments of German law," says Gosselin, "establish, or clearly suppose the special dependance of the emperor on the pope."§ He refers to the Saxon and Suabian codes, and alludes to the custom, to which even Frederick Barbarossa acceded, of the emperor acting at the coronation as the Pope's esquire.¶

And nearly, moreover, all Italy originally and by right belonged to the Holy See, as is shown clearly by Döllinger.** So that the aggressions and occupations could

* Gosselin, v. ii. p. 323.

† Ib. p. 283.

‡ Ib. 284.

|| 285.

§ 287.

¶ 288.

** Hist. Church Vindicated, by Dr. Coxe, v. iii., pp. 114, 138, 150.

scarcely be upon the side of the Holy See, but of irreligious and avaricious princes. This in fact is the account given with perfect truth by these great Catholic historians, and by others as great—but Protestant. Gosselin says that, ‘the sovereigns against whom the Holy See struggled with in the Middle Ages,’ “were princes guilty of excesses the most notorious, and most baneful to the interests of religion and of nations,—they were adulterous, simoniacal, purjured, abettors of heresy and schism, and *oppressors* of their subjects.”’ This is the character (he adds) unanimously given by all historians of the emperor Henry IV., deposed by Gregory VII., of the emperor Frederick II., deposed by Innocent IV.* And then he goes on to say, (a statement very material for our present argument), “consider in particular the character of Henry IV., such as it has been drawn from the pages of contemporary historians by modern writers, least liable to the suspicion of partiality to the Holy See. He was even in his eighteenth year one of the most profligate characters. He had two or three concubines at the same time, and whenever he heard of any beautiful young woman, married or unmarried, if he could not seduce her he had her carried off by violence. These crimes involved him in many murders, to make away with the husbands of the women whom he coveted. He became cruel even to his most trusted associates. He gave bishoprics to those who gave him most money, and who knew best how to further his vices, and after having thus sold a bishopric, if another person offered him more money, or was more lavish in flattering his crimes, he ordered the former bishop to be deposed for simony, and appointed the second in his place, whence it happened that many cities had two bishops at the same time, and both unworthy.”†

And again, “if we trace back to their source the troubles of the empire under Henry IV., we shall find that the original cause of these troubles was the unprecedented conduct and sacrilege of that prince, who persisted in the most scandalous disorders, and shamelessly trampled on the rights of the Church, making himself sovereign arbiter of ecclesiastical dignities within his dominions.”‡ Dr.

* V. ii. p. 335.

† Ib. 336.

‡ Ib. 339.

Döllinger gives a similar account, and speaking of Pope Alexander II., says, "the last important step taken by Alexander, the full consequences of which devolved upon his more daring successor, was his excommunication of those counsellors of Henry, who had sold ecclesiastical dignities.* And elsewhere he says, "A most baneful influence was exercised by Adalbert, Archbishop of Bremen, who had won the favour of the young king. This vain, ambitious, and at the same time, avaricious and prodigal prelate, who wished to erect for himself a patriarchate in the north, and who had before disposed of bishoprics according to his caprice,—united himself with another favourite of the king, and carried on with him a shameless commerce in bishoprics and abbeys. The unworthy bishops who had intruded themselves into the different sees, carried their ideas further in the practice of that simony by which they had obtained their Churches. In 1090 Pope Alexander II. employed against them the bitter reproach that they gave ordination for money. Thus a multitude of rude, ignorant, conscienceless men, found their way into the ranks of the German clergy, working on their state as a trade, and the bishops engaged in worldly affairs and projects of aggrandizement, either deficient themselves in moral virtue, or too timid to engage in a laborious contest, suffered the evil to continue."† Who appointed those bishops? Not the Holy See, but the Crown. It was on the very question of the influence of the Crown, on their appointment, that Gregory VII. waged his great contest with the emperor. Who was responsible for these abuses! The Holy See? No, but the Crown. The Holy See was continually protesting against them, and reproaching the profligate princes, and their parasites, the unworthy prelates whom they appointed. Yet such is the perversity of prejudice that Gregory is popularly called ambitious, and proud, for seeking to prevent these shameless prostitutions of ecclesiastical dignities, and the Popes are, by the same writers, accused of permitting them! How could the Pontiffs be responsible for abuses they had not the power to prevent? "The history of succeeding ages," says

* Hist. Ch. v. iii. p. 152.

† p. 229.

Gosselin, "proves that the contest of the Popes with the Emperors, and the evils resulting from them were occasioned in the commencement of the conquest, and often schismatical pretensions of the emperor. And he cites the Count de Maistre, who states as to Frederick II., that Innocent IV. ended most justly by solemnly deposing the emperor, (at the council of Lyons) in 1245, for the crimes of perjury, sacrilege, heresy, and felony, juridically proved and admitted in the council."* Gosselin goes on to say, "It was for the contests between Frederick II. and Popes Gregory IX. and Innocent IV. that arose in Italy the two parties, the Guelphs and Ghibellines, who caused so much trouble and disorder in the country during two centuries."† This brings us near to the era of the Reformation, and when the historian shows religion had nothing to do with the contests, he falls upon the very truth, which it is our object in this article to establish.

Religion had nothing to do with the Reformation. The Reformation was not the result of religious, but of irreligious feelings. It was a continuance of a revolt against right, against justice, and against religion, which had raged for centuries, and had its origin in the corruptions, not of the Papacy, but of the princes who oppressed it,—the corruptions of human nature, on which the Church had to wage war. In that war her weapons, which were spiritual, only had force so long as the faith of the people lasted; when the evil influences of princes had, by corrupting the episcopate and thus depraving the clergy, sapped that faith, the sword of the Church lost its power, and the abuses it could not suppress enslaved her, took an established form in the Reformation, which was, therefore, not a reaction from abuses, or a restoration of religion, but the installation of rebellion, and the final triumph of abuses against which the Holy See had long struggled. The Reformation only established as principles the iniquities of Henry IV.

Ranke expresses the proposition we have been establishing, "a participation in ecclesiastical revenues, and the right of promotion to Church benefices and offices, was that which the civil power now especially desired."‡ The

* Gosselin, v. ii. p. 342.

† Ib. 342.

‡ v. i. p. 31.

history of Germany, or of any other country, shows this, and shows that the object of heresy was to escape the moral control of the Church, by pandering to this propensity in the civil power. Confining ourselves on this occasion to Germany, we could prove our case from Protestant historians. Thus, glancing at the pages of a modern writer, we find him stating that, in 1273, Ottocar of Bohemia, a rebel against the Holy See, rejected with disdain all the proposals of accommodation made by the judicious and conciliating Pontiff, (Gregory X.) “but prevented the clergy of Bohemia from contributing the tenths of their revenues.”* Passing on to a generation later, we find him speaking of the deplorable situation to which Bohemia was reduced by the dreadful oppressions of the Regent Otho of Brandenburg, (who seems to have thus early afforded an illustration of the predatory propensities of his house). “After transporting into his own territories all the treasures of the Church,”.....“he placed the administration in the hands of the Bishop of Brandenburg, who, if possible, surpassed the Regent in exactions, cruelty, and extortion.”† Under it there arose those dissensions between Bohemia and Austria, which had a great influence on the development of the schism of Huss and Jerome of Prague. Albert, says the Protestant historian, was of a despotic and encroaching spirit, and he does not seem to have observed that this may have had to do with the contest in which he was engaged with Pope Boniface VIII. in 1300. We find the emperor in that contest early securing the neutrality of the Margrave of Brandenburg and the Elector of Saxony,—two of the German princes, who have always been found, from political reasons, rebellious against the Holy See, and who, with the instinct of rapacity, foresaw, what their successors found, their greatest opportunities of aggrandizement in the war to which the Reformation was certain to give rise.

The brutality of Philip the Fair relieved Albert from Boniface, but, by an exemplary retribution “his encroaching spirit,” to use the Protestant historian’s phrase, soon caused him the loss of Bohemia. Nor was it long ere the Holy See was fearfully avenged on the House of Austria

* Hist. House of Austria, v. i. p. 24.

† Ib. 51.

by the Swiss. The schism of Huss was successful chiefly by reason of the jealousy of a weak and wicked Bohemian sovereign, towards the Catholic House of Hapsburg, which, in Albert V., found a worthy representative. In the words of the same Protestant historian we will state the story: "Under the mild dominion of Charles IV., Bohemia enjoyed a long period of peace and tranquillity, had greatly increased in riches, splendour, and territory, and the natives were rapidly advancing in learning and civilization. After the foundation of a university Prague became the abode of learning and science." All this was the result, let it be observed, of the Catholic religion, under the Supremacy of the Holy See. "But during the reign of Wenceslaus, Bohemia rapidly declined, and the nobles broke out into sedition. The inactive and careless monarch, addicted to wine and pleasure, was of a character ill calculated to repress these disorders." "Under these circumstances a dispute, which, under the reign of a more able monarch, would probably have been confined within the walls of a University, gave rise to those religious feuds which occasioned the Hussite war, and rendered Bohemia for many years a scene of rapine and carnage." "In consequence of the long schism in the Papacy," (originated by wicked princes, such as Philip the Fair,) "the arrogant exactions of the Pontiffs," whose "exactions," as we have shown, were exactions of their rights, "and the licentious conduct of the clergy," entirely owing, as we have also shown, to the corruptions introduced by wicked princes, such as Wenceslaus, "several learned men began to embrace and propagate opinions hostile to the principles and pretences of the Roman See."*

"Among these, John Huss, a member of the University of Prague and confessor to Queen Sophia, the wife of Wenceslaus, strenuously asserted the principles of Wickliffe, the English reformer, and levelled his attack against the pretensions of the Pope, particularly *against the sale of indulgences*, issued by Boniface VIII." We pause here to remark upon the great adroitness shewn by these heretics on the choice of their *cheval de bataille*. Huss herein imitated Wickliffe, and Luther, as we shall see, followed Huss. All, then, took care to commence

* Coxe, v. i. p. 149.

their attacks against the Holy See upon *matters of money*: and while they well knew they would have the sympathy and support of the *sovereigns* who were always seeking to aggrandize themselves at the expense of the Church. We have in a former article shown how this was in the case of Wickliffe. We see now it was in the instance of Huss. We shall afterwards see it exactly the case with Luther. All of them showing therein that, indeed, without being "harmless as doves," they were certainly "cunning as serpents." They appealed to the sordid and the selfish elements in human nature. And they were amply responded to. Lust disliked restraint, avarice yearned to gratify its rapacity. Both alike revolted from a system of compensation, by which works of charity might reap some benefit to the poor, from deeds of sensuality or of blood. Sinners loved to hear of a barren penitence; and Sovereigns liked to be told of earthly treasures which might be seized, rather than of heavenly treasures which might be won.

No wonder, then, that Wenceslaus, "the weak, mean, and wicked prince," as he is described by the Protestant historian, "encouraged Huss;" it was hardly necessary to add that he did "so from resentment against Boniface," whose "intrigues" (had Mr. Coxe been writing of intrigues *against the Papacy*, he would have used the word which would have been more fair and proper here—*influence*) "had contributed to precipitate him from the imperial throne"—a precipitation which it appears he abundantly deserved. Nor is it wonderful that, as Mr. Coxe goes on to state, "Even Sigismund himself did not disapprove the opposition raised to the sale of indulgences."* Of course he did not; not being a *very* religiously minded man, and more keenly alive to the value of money than of piety; such sovereigns could scarcely disapprove of an opposition to a system under which the piety and charity of the faithful often poured into the Treasury of Rome sums which they would much rather have seen within their *own*. Owing to the encouragement thus given to the Hussite heresy by Wenceslaus and Sigismund, it spread so far and so fast that even the death of Huss did not eradicate it; and then Wenceslaus, from the same despicable reasons as before, encouraged Ziska, who in 1419 commenced his career by a savage shedding of blood; and

* Coxe, v. i. p. 149.

under whose savage aspirations, Mr. Coxe truly states, the Hussites gave way to frantic enthusiasm, broke into the churches, overturned the altars and burned convents, whilst the whole country was desolated by religious warfare.*

Under the auspices of the Holy See something like a reconciliation was effected, but the influence of one whom Mr. Coxe justly calls an "abandoned woman"—the Empress Barbara—"who believed neither God, angel, nor devil," the Hussite heresy was revived before the death of Sigismund. She used the power of the heretics for the purpose of acquiring the succession to the Empire; and on the accession of Albert to that dignity, though the Bohemian Catholics accepted him, the Hussites resisted him, and he had to win the crown by arms. And his death plunged Germany into anarchy. This was within half a century of the birth of Luther. And such were the fruits of schism, which heralded his appearance. Too little importance has been attached, we think, to these antecedents. The annals of a nation are reckoned not by years but by generations, and a century is nothing in its history. But the interval of time between Huss and Luther, hardly exceeded the life of a man. And the first was more than the precursor of the other. He was his teacher, his exemplar in the fatal work of disturbing a nation by pandering to its evil passions and those of its sovereigns. The task was too easy, and scarcely required a precursor to suggest it. Indeed even in the means employed, as we shall see, there was no originality in Luther. He followed his exemplar in means as well as in aims. He raised a rebellion against the Church under the mask of religion, and he did so—as Huss did—simply by setting forth a system relieved of all that made religion irksome to bad men; in short, by constructing a religion of licentiousness, he acquired the suffrages of the licentious and irreligious, which, alas! included most of the rulers and a great part of the ruled.

Now, during this period, what had been the character of the Papacy? "In 1417, the Council of Constance, (says Mr. Coxe,) had closed the schism, and had given to the Christian world a Pope, Martin V., to whom the Church

* Ib. 153-4.

was indebted for union, Italy for tranquillity, and Rome for union. During a reign of sixteen years, his moderation, prudence, and vigour, maintained the Church in peace and unity; he even agreed to the reformation of several corruptions; he consented to the abolition of annates, the fees paid for palliums and provisors, and other similar exactions." It is gratifying to be informed by a Protestant historian that a Pope could "*even agree*" to "the reformation of corruptions," and still more gratifying to find that the "corruptions" complained of in those days were so comparatively unimportant, at all events to the Church, as "annates" and "fees paid for palliums, and provisors"—all, in fact, of a purely *pecuniary* nature, and not affecting doctrine or discipline. But though comparatively unimportant to the Church, they were not so to the princes of those days. To repeat the passage we have already cited from Ranke, it was mainly about these very matters that they were most anxious, matters relating to money or patronage. It mattered not to them that if the annual contributions of archiepiscopal or other sees to the Holy See were discontinued, the Holy See would be impoverished and unable to maintain its magnificent position as the centre of the Christian world with its due and its accustomed hospitality, liberality, and magnanimity. That the princes cared nothing for; they desired rather to amass all possible treasures for the purposes of luxury and sensuality, and they felt, whenever money went to Rome, the pangs of avaricious jealousy and sordid envy. It was so in Germany, as it was in France and England. The sovereigns of England had passed their statutes "of provisors of benefices," for the purpose of keeping all the benefices to themselves, and perverting their patronage to the base ends of avarice. And half a century or so later, when Henry VIII. of England became inspired with a desire for the supremacy, it was indicated by measures for the abolition of "annates and fees paid for palliums;" and his spirit was precisely that of Henry IV. of Germany, that of rapacious covetousness for the property of the Church. When Nicholas V. resumed the "annates" and fees for palliums, and retained the right of alternate presentations to benefices, (although in other respects he showed every anxiety to reform,) the "concordates" he consented to "disappointed," (says Mr. Coxe,) "the hopes of those princes who were anxious to reform the abuses of the Church," i. e., to seize her pro-

perty and confiscate her just rights. For that these were the "abuses" they desired to "reform" is plain enough. It will be difficult to discover any trace of complaints of "abuses" *against the Holy See*, except such as resolved themselves into an unwillingness to pay ancient and accustomed dues; complaints, too, made chiefly by the sovereigns who desired to receive them into their own coffers. The burden of the preambles of the statutes passed in this country during the same period was the same: that money went to Rome. While whatever abuses really existed, arose, as we have shown, from the influence of the princes themselves, and were such, therefore, as they by no means desired to see redressed. Therefore it was that the "reformers" they favoured applied themselves primarily not to these the *real* abuses, but to the "abuses" which the princes disliked, appealing to their pride and their avarice against obedience or contributions to Rome. Hence the Hussites obtained the patronage of Wenceslaus, and the connivance of Sigismund. Hence Albert "wisely," as Mr. Coxe considers, held himself neutral between the Pope and the Anti-pope, the true council and the schismatical, (the weaker the Papacy was, the better for these selfish princes,) and on the same principle, as we shall see, Maximilian favoured Luther, and Charles V. connived at his heresy.

Before coming to the career of Luther, let us take a rapid glance at the political aspect of the age and its religious condition. *Politically*, as in the age of Huss, the fortunes of heresy depended very much on the enmity between Bohemia and Austria:—in the age of Luther they depended greatly on the rivalry between Austria and France. "Before 1447," as Mr. Coxe truly points out, "France and the house of Austria had no subject of rivalry or jealousy, but the marriage of Maximilian with the heiress of Burgundy entailed on the two powers an hereditary enmity, which deluged Europe with blood for more than three centuries."* And this enmity was at its height at the very time when Luther arose. Ranke points out another element in his political importance, and observes upon it thus. "Throughout the whole period of time that we are contemplating, there was no assistance so

* Coxe i. p. 279.

much desired by the temporal sovereigns in their disputes with the Popes, as that of a *spiritual* opposition to their decrees. Charles VIII. of France had no more efficient ally against Alexander VI. than the Dominican Savonarola. But when had the Pope so bold an opponent as Luther? The mere fact that so fearless a foe to the popedom had made his appearance, imparted to the person of the reformer *a decided political importance*. It was thus that Maximilian considered it; nor would he permit injury of any kind to be offered to the monk; he caused him to be specially recommended to the Elector of Saxony; 'there might come a time when he would be needed;' and from that moment the influence of Luther increased day by day."* Here is the true history of the "Reformation." Luther was 'needed,' in the general contest of kings against the Holy See, (in which contest we have proved, upon Protestant authority, the Popes were always in the right,) and especially he was 'needed' in the contest between France and Austria.

So much for the political aspect of affairs: what was the state of religion? Partly we have shown already. For instance, the rapid progress of Bohemia under Catholic teaching, prior to the outbreak of the Hussite heresy, is eloquent as to the real results of the religion which we have lately learnt tends to "stifle the reason and enslave the soul." The universities, from Paris to Prague, the schools of Padua or Oxford, Bologna or Auxerre, had all owed their origin to the Catholic Church. The monasteries had been nurseries of all learning, sacred and profane. In Germany Ranke ascribes the revival of classic learning to the monks. "It was one of this brotherhood, the profound and blameless mystic Thomas à Kempis, from whose school proceeded those earnest and venerable men who, first drawn to Italy by the light of ancient learning newly kindled there, afterwards returned to pour its beneficent influence over the breadth of Germany."† Boccaccio and Dante had used the learning they acquired in the bosom of the Church to do their utmost by ridicule or railing, to rend her robe of unity by weakening the hold on nations of the Apostolic See. And Erasmus and Luther were about in different ways and degrees to act the

* Ranke i. p. 65.

† Ranke v. i. 57.

same unfilial and ungrateful part; to labour, by derision and denunciation, to undermine the faith of others in the religion which had given them all that was good in them. After all, the best testimony in favour of the *intellectual* wealth of the Church, were the men who did so much to ruin her influence among mankind. Intellectually they were great, but they owed their greatness to her, and gained all that knowledge from her which they afterwards turned against her.

Audin, in the appendix to his work, gives a sketch of the labours of the monks in Germany during the Middle Ages, prior to the eleventh century. And thus he proceeds. "After that time, until the revival of letters, different schools arose in the theological world. Scholasticism soon had its reign, and this rendered essential service to the human intellect." Among its great apostles he mentions St. Thomas. That great name, which sheds such a glory over Germany in the thirteenth century, was but the symbol of the spirit and system of the Church, in which faith and philosophy, reason and devotion, were beautifully harmonized. And even if we were to admit with Audin, that "the light which the monasteries had first caused to shine, was for a short while obscured, especially towards the end of the fourteenth century," and that a "reform was necessary;" the restoration was effected by a monk; that monk was Trithemius, and the Appendix gives a deeply interesting account of his career, one of the most valuable portions of the book, for it is an illustration, far more effectual than any force of reasoning, to show the actual state and spirit of the Church at the very time that Luther arose. For it was almost at the very date of Luther's birth that Trithemius entered on his monastic life. His maxim was, "Knowledge is love." How beautiful the contrast to the proud axiom which Protestantism has adopted, "Knowledge is power." The whole difference between Catholicism and Protestantism is in the distinction between the two expressions. "*The more we love,*" said the monk, explaining his proposition, "the more we know." "The Bible is the source of all learning." He said not that it was the source of all religious teaching, or the rule of faith. "Labour constantly to *relish* the Scriptures." "The devils have knowledge, but as they have not love their knowledge is useless and unprofitable." What a contrast to the spirit of Luther—

proud, restless, disputatious. It seems as if Divine Providence has roused up the monk of Spanheim as a practical confutation of the monk of Wittenberg; just as the Saint of Loyola was shortly afterwards raised up to counteract the new heresy; whose principle, in exact accordance with that of Trithemius, and in equal antagonism to the fatal error of the age, was, “non enim abundantia scientiæ sed sensus et gustus rerum interior desiderium animæ replere solet.” Trithemius was not more remarkable for devotion than for erudition, “and his works,” says Audin, “equally show his love for his brethren, his enthusiasm for the Chair of St. Peter, and his devotion to literature.” “In 1516,” he adds, “this great light of the Middle Ages was extinguished. But his labours were not lost; the reformation worked by Trithemius at Spanheim was *introduced into most of the monasteries of Germany.*” Julius II., be it observed, warmly commended the pious monk, and held him up to imitation. “Thus the monasteries originated,” says Audin, “an intellectual movement. And at the same time the taste for *sacred studies*, which Trithemius recommended so earnestly revived; the book of the Gospels was adorned with engravings; the Passion of the God-Man was illustrated by engravings; the Songs of the Prophet-King were commented on in a popular language; the ineffable charms of Bible-morality were celebrated; the teaching of the Lord’s Prayer was expounded.” Rome at the same time spoke by the voice of the Council of Lateran, which was dissolved in 1517. “She desired,” says Audin, “reformation; Luther a *rebellion.*”

Writers on the Reformation on the one hand deal in vague declamation about “abuses” in the church, without considering of what nature they were, or whence they arose, or by whom they were perpetuated; and on the other hand appear to ignore or not at all to consider the repeated efforts of the Holy See to redress them; when it is considered that the corrupt ecclesiastics whose misconduct brought scandal upon the church were forced upon her by the princes who prostituted their patronage, and who oppressed the Holy See for purposes of sordid rapacity, and that the Holy See through many successive generations, up to the end of the Reformation, vainly endeavoured to wrestle against the overwhelming evil, all its endeavours being rendered useless by this corrupt perversion of patronage, and by the constant efforts of the

emperors to enslave it and destroy its independence—it is really flagrant injustice, and a reckless disregard of historical truth, to affect to cast on the Holy See the responsibility of the “abuses” which are alleged as excusing or justifying the fatal schism of the Reformation. Such Pontiffs as the learned and pious Benedict XII. (1335) were zealous and energetic pastors of the Church, ages before heresy assumed the specious mask of “reformation.” Innocent VI. laboured hard to reform the abuses in the Church (1353), and denounced especially non-residence and luxury among the prelates and by her clergy, abuses notoriously arising from the corrupt use of patronage by princes, and prevailing most among those ecclesiastics who were their parasites. Urban VI. (1366), published a bull ordering provincial councils to reform abuses in their respective churches, and a few years after (1370), Gregory XI. published a similar Bull. What could be more significant as to the true seat and source of the corruptions which prevailed in the Church? They did not emanate from the Holy See, they were seated in the provincial churches, and arose from the local prostitution of patronage by the princes. Hence the Pontiffs repeatedly called on the *provincial councils* to remedy them, by canons devoted to that object, and adapted to the special ministrations of each national church. But the Pontiffs appealed in vain to a prelacy and a clergy too much under the influence of princes, to care for the successor of St. Peter. And instead of redressing the abuses which really existed, they rather joined with the princes, their patrons, in stigmatizing as “abuses” the ancient and accustomed dues, which the Holy See had from the first establishment of the Church received, as tributes from the piety and charity of the faithful to the Apostolic Chair. That same spirit of avarice which led them to be the tools of princes in a vile traffic of Church patronage, led them to treat their benefices as stock-in-trade, and to grudge to the See of Rome any contributions from their enormous ecclesiastical property, which men of old had, by the teaching of that See, been led to dedicate to the Church; which they held in trust for Church purposes, and on which the Apostolic See had a high and sacred claim. These sordid ecclesiastics, jealous of any contributions to the Holy See, were ready enough to yield with a lavish subserviency to the impious exactions of princes their patrons. Even the

Council of Basle (1433) found it necessary to lay it down that ecclesiastics ought to administer Church property faithfully, but that their possessions could not be seized without sacrilege by the lay power. Before passing from this subject it is important to draw attention to a fact which Audin incidentally alludes to, and which is pregnant with significance as to the real motives of the chief promoter of the movement of Luther, that the Elector of Saxony had a quarrel with the Holy See, and Albert, Archbishop of Mayence, on account of the refusal to admit a bastard son of the Elector to an ecclesiastical dignity. Thus, not merely in its remote, but in its immediate antecedents, the Lutheran movement is identified with the main source of the abuses, while it affected to be directed against, the perversion of Church patronage by princes.

“The cloister,” says Audin, “was the holy ark which brought together in the great shipwreck of literature, the inspired writings: to the monk we are indebted for the first translation of the Bible into the German language:—Ottfred of Wertsenburg, in the tenth century, versified the Old Testament and the Psalms; Rabanus Maurus and Walfred had translated the whole Scriptures: and in the fifteenth century at Augsburg and Nuremberg, versions of the Bible were published by those very monks whom the Reformers reviled so cruelly. It was they who gave to the world Erasmus and Reuchlin.”* And we will add, Luther. “His most pleasant hours were spent in the library of the Augustinians at Erfurt.† Printing had been discovered, be it remembered, and at Mayence and Cologne the sacred books were published in every form and size. The monastery had Latin versions, and Luther then learnt to “read his Bible.” He was not always ungrateful to the monks and schoolmen, and somewhere speaks of Peter Lombard as entitled to the esteem and gratitude of mankind. But, alas, he soon learnt ingratitude, and abused his instructors and benefactors as “ignorant.” Nor was the intellectual enlightenment of the nation inferior to their scriptural and theological instruction, and their material progress was equal to their

* Life of Luther, vol. i. 12.

† Ib. 7.

moral. In the eloquent language of Balmez, under the influence of Catholicism, Europe everywhere displayed extreme activity; a spirit of enterprise was developed in all hearts; the hour had come when the nations of Europe were about to see open before them a new horizon of power and grandeur, the limits whereof were invisible to the eye. Magellan discovered the strait which united the east and west, and Sebastian—returning to the Spanish coast after having made the tour of the world—seemed to be the sublime impersonation of European civilization taking possession of the universe.” “The development of the mind kept pace with the increase of power. Erasmus examined all the sources of knowledge, astonished the world by his talents and his learning, and spread his fame in triumph from one end of Europe to the other.

“The distinguished Spaniard, Louis Vives, rivalled the *savant* of Rotterdam, and undertook nothing less than to regenerate the sciences, and give a new direction to the human mind. In Italy the schools of philosophy were in a state of fermentation, and they seized with avidity the new lights brought from Constantinople. In the same country the genius of Dante and Petrarch was continued in their illustrious successors; the land of Tasso resounded with his accents, like the nightingale announcing the coming of the dawn, while Spain, intoxicated with her triumphs and transported with pride at the sight of her conquests, sang like a soldier who after victory reposes on a heap of trophies.”

“But the voice of the Apostate who was about to cast discord into the bosom of paternal nations, already resounded in the heart of Germany.”* His life before his apostacy testifies to the truth of the religion he afterwards laboured to destroy. In the monastery he had full scope alike for piety and study, and if his studies were excessive, and his piety morbid, it is plain it was not the fault of the monks. He was an embodiment of pride and self-will. His superiors aware of this, sought to test his vocation by humiliating exercises; he complained, and the university interfered, as did Staupitz his friend and confessor, who feared he would sink under the trial.† Would that he

* Protestantism and Catholicism, translated by Hanford and Kershaw, p. 214.

† Audin, 15.

had been rejected. He and Europe would have been probably saved from his heresy. It shows how fatal an error it is to allow false indulgence to dispense with due tests of a vocation. Too late, his confessor found out his sad mistake. Luther carried to an injurious extent his austerities, his pride encouraging that puritanical spirit of gloom which arises from the absence of a humble reliance on Divine mercy and the merits of our Lord. Staupitz said, "*God does not wish all this from you.*"* What he wanted was humility, and that was what Luther had not. Hence he fell. "By pride fell the angels."

Before he fell he visited Rome. Two things must be borne in mind in regard to what he afterwards wrote as to his impressions in Italy. First, it can be of little consequence what he wrote on that subject after he had fallen, as his representations can scarcely be relied on as to what had been his impressions at the time. Secondly, even as to his sincere impressions, supposing they could be arrived at as they are of the less consequence, by reason of the prejudices with which a German in that time must have visited Italy. M. Audin says, "had the patriotic prayers of Luther been heard, Maximilian would have reigned at Rome," and Bologna, Urbino, Parma, and Piacenze would have been the four jewels of his emperor's "crown." Prejudice blinded him. He did not understand Julius II., ignorant that his sword had saved the existence of Italy as a nation, and that without that sword, which Julius had the right to wield as a temporal prince, Rome perhaps would have fallen into the hands of the doge of Venice or the French monarch.† Audin well describes the reason for which Luther could feel no sympathy with Rome,‡ summing up in this pregnant sentence, "Because Rome is not made according to his ideas he condemns Rome." There is the spirit of heresy, which was latent within him. The pride which lurked in his soul had led him to bring religion down to the low level of his own soul, rather than to seek to raise her by the ennobling inspiration of Catholicism. How low the level of his mind was, Audin well expresses: "Of all the wonders which Rome displayed in the time of Julius II., he saw nothing. No gleam from the crown of Perugino or Michael Angelo

* Ib. 17.

† Audin, 29.

‡ Ib. 30.

dazzled his eyes; he remained cold and dumb before all the treasures of painting and sculpture collected in the Churches, his ear was closed to the strains of Dante which the people sung in the streets.”* And instead of being enchanted with the noble fabric of St. Peter, he grumbled at its cost! Little could Luther appreciate the character of a great Pontiff like Julius II., who had been engaged in a deadly struggle for the purpose of liberating Italy, and of whom Roscoe says, “His vigorous and active mind corresponded with the restless temper of the times, his ambition was not the passion of a grovelling mind, nor were the advantages he sought of a temporary or personal nature. To establish the authority of the Holy See throughout Europe, to recover the dominions of the Church, to expel all foreign powers from Italy, and to restore that country to the dominion of its native princes, were the vast objects of his comprehensive mind. And these objects he lived in a great degree to accomplish.”† Of course he did not accomplish them without incurring the hatred of the foreign princes whom he had expelled out of Italy, and among others, the Emperor. And Ginciciardini, an hereditary dignitary of the Empire, and an admirer of Charles V., whose troops sacked Rome, has done his best (or his worst) to give the great Pontiff an immortality of infamy. Even *Protestant* writers, however, as in the case of Roscoe, have done, in a great degree, justice to his memory. At the *time*, however, one may conceive with what sentiments a proud, coarse-minded German, would regard such a Pontiff. And in the very year in which Luther visited Italy, 1510, the Emperor and the King of France were both under his anathemas for their unrighteous conduct towards the Holy See.‡ And Louis XII., disposed to play the part of Charles VIII. in Italy, proposed to Maximilian the convocation of a council to depose the Pope, and both were in that state of mind in which they would eagerly hail another Savonarola.§ In 1511, the schismatical council of Pisa was actually convened by the Emperor.||

* Ib. 31.

† Rosc. Life Leo X., p. 291.

‡ Ib. 245.

§ Ib. p. 245.

|| Ib. p. 249.

Describing the state of things at the close of the fifteenth century, the historian of the House of Austria informs us that, "The spiritual power of the Popes had gradually declined, and their authority had lost most of its influence. Germany had in a public diet declared itself independent of the Pope, and even the minor princes of Europe disregarded or despised the thunders of the Vatican. At the same time the dominions of the Roman See were nearly confined to the neighbourhood of Rome, and of those ample possessions which had been granted or confirmed by the Emperors, the principal part had been appropriated by powerful families."* Maximilian had formed an insane scheme for the conquest of Italy—the darling project of so many successive Emperors from the days of Frederic. The old contest for the possessions of Italy still continued, and it was embittered and embarrassed by the new rivalry of France. The mad expedition of Charles VIII. into Naples, had been imitated both by Maximilian and by Louis; and Julius II., like preceding and subsequent Pontiffs, had hard work to rescue Italy from these unscrupulous invasions. At last Maximilian and Louis united their forces, the Emperor was emboldened to assume an attitude of decided aggression upon the papacy, and in 1510, the very year of Luther's visit to Rome, "revived," says Mr. Coxe, "the ancient disputes between the church and the empire, by laying before the diet a list of the grievances which the German nation had suffered from the exactions and pretensions of the Popes,"† the "exactions" being such as "annates," or first fruits of benefices, and the fees on palliums, etc., and the "pretensions" included indulgences, which were obnoxious to the rapacity of princes, as the means of conveying money out of their dominions.

Such was Luther's supreme Sovereign, an enemy to the Papacy, while his own immediate lord, Frederic, the Elector of Saxony, was friendly to heresy. So that from the one he had nothing to fear and from the other everything to hope, in the event of his entering on the career of a heretic. Such princes were not, of course, likely to be at all careful to preserve in the minds of their subjects any reverence for Rome, or to protect them from the infec-

* Hist. House Austria, v. i. 297.

† Ib. p. 356.

tion of heresy. Let it be recollected that for nearly a century the heresy of Huss had been spreading over the empire from Bohemia, and that its spirit of insolent and irreverent scepticism had infused itself into a large portion of the people. The results are described even by Protestant historians: "To Boccacio succeeded," says Roscoe, "several writers whose works considered in other points of view are of little importance, but which contributed to sap the foundations of the Roman power and to weaken, in the minds of the people, the influence and authority of the Holy See." Such was the "*Facetiæ*" of Poggio, of *which upwards of ten editions were printed in the last thirty years of the fifteenth century*. They were also published at Antwerp and Leipsic, an evident proof in that early state of the art of printing, that the work had obtained great celebrity not only in Italy, but throughout the whole extent of Christendom.* Audin more particularly describes some of the German writers of this scoffing school, of whom we are sorry to say Erasmus was the most illustrious as Hutten was the most infamous. His *Epistolæ Obscurorum Errorum*, justly called by Audin, "that work more filthy than eloquent," is so obscene that even in a learned language some passages of it cannot be transferred to the notes. And this was only a specimen of works, if not so atrocious quite as mischievous; satires which sought to rival "the Praise of Folly;" such as the "Ship of Fools," in which the clergy were held up to ridicule and freely exposed to contempt. Encouraged by the co-operation of the Emperor, Louis revived the pragmatic sanction of Charles VII. which, says the Protestant historian, was like the electoral union in Germany, calculated to diminish the *revenues and patronage* of the Church, and he also obtained from the national (Gallican) council a request to summon a general council at Pisa, for the *ostensible* purpose of reforming ecclesiastical abuses.† Here are the words of the Protestant historian, and it will be observed that they indicate his own sense of the *real* object of Maximilian and Louis, to secure a larger share of the revenues and patronage of the Church under the pretext of reforming ecclesiastical

* Life of Leo X. v. ii. p. 85.

† Coxe, v. i. p. 350,

abuses; the only "abuses" having arisen, as we have before shown, from the control exercised by the Crown over the patronage of the Church, and the consequent introduction of corrupt ecclesiastics into her benefices. "Maximilian," continues Mr. Coxe, "warmly concurred in the views of Louis, and proposed in 1510 to introduce a similar pragmatic sanction into Germany. His circular letter to the States breathes a spirit of hostility against the Pope, *scarcely less vehement than the declaration of the early emperors or the writing of the Protestant reformers.*" Here the gravamen of his complaint is, that "enormous sums are *extorted from Germany,*"* precisely the complaint of Henry VIII. of England and his Parliament, that money went out of the country to Rome. The historian mentions too in the next page another great reason for this especial outbreak of hostility against the Holy See, "that from the preceding negotiations, the Emperor was aware that the *Pope would not allow him an establishment in Italy.*"† To all which it is to be added, that Maximilian himself actually aspired to the Papacy.‡

As we have already observed, it was not enough to allege that abuses existed in order to cast the responsibility of them on Rome. They arose, as we have shown, from the corrupt use of the patronage of the Church by the Crown. And it was part of the policy of the worldly-minded men, who thus corrupted the Church, to throw the odium of the scandals caused by the conduct of their own class upon the Holy See. It was not, however, the Holy See which shrank either from acknowledging the abuses or from attempting to correct them. It was a Cardinal who at the Council of Basle denounced to the Pope the disorders of the German clergy. Julius II. had summoned the fourth Council of Lateran for the purposes of reform, and the labours of that council were most salutary. "For many years," says Audin, "Rome had promised a clerical reformation. That word had no fears for her. She had pronounced it under Nicholas V., Sixtus IV., and Innocent VIII. In the midst of all the storms which threatened at the same time the double sovereignty of the Pope, Julius II. was incessantly occupied with the necessities of

* Ibid.

† Ib. 359.

‡ See his extraordinary letter, Coxe, v. i. 362, *in notis.*

Christendom. In this he was imitated by his successor. And after the example of Alexander III.," adds Audin, "Leo X. desired that thenceforth none should be raised to the priesthood but men of exemplary conduct after long preparation."* "The field of the Lord," said the Pope, in 1514, "ought to be thoroughly upturned, in order to produce new fruits."† And to use the French historian's expression, "Leo's zeal made the Lateran ring for the glory of Christendom."

Dr. Dollinger in his "Synopsis View of the Life and Writings of Luther," states, that "Luther had felt and deplored the abuses in the Church; the incapacity and vice of so many ecclesiastics; the neglected state of the people, and other things: as other intelligent men who were attached to the Church had felt and deplored these things:" and elsewhere he says, speaking of Luther's rise, "It was a spectacle which *reasonably* claimed the attention of all, a contrast which gained for him and his cause the sympathy even of the best disposed persons. On one side stood a whole swarm of prelates, ecclesiastical dignitaries and possessors of benefices, who were richly endowed with earthly goods, passed their lives in supineness, and troubled themselves little about the necessities and decay of the Church." Now this is a view from which we venture to differ, and from which, indeed, although with sincere respect for Dr. Dollinger, we do most earnestly and indignantly dissent. Not only do we differ as to the degree to which his picture of the religious state of Germany is true (a picture not very consistent with the facts we have set forth), but what is far more important, we deprecate the absence of any endeavour on his part to point his readers' attention to this monstrous fact, that the abuses, such as they were, of the German Church, arose from the national Church itself, whereas all Luther's denunciations were directed against the Holy See. It is a flagrant fact, that it was the local exercise of patronage by the princes which gave rise to abuses in the Church: and that the Holy See not only had little if any responsibility for it, but was then and always had been strenuously striving to eradicate those evils, which corrupt use of patronage had


* Audin's Life of Luther, v. i. p. 79.

† Ib.

‡ Ib. p. 82.

created. And if indeed there were these "swarms" of prelates, and possessors of benefices richly endowed, and passing their lives in supineness, of whom Dr. Dollinger speaks, surely it would have been well that he should have remembered who presented them to the bishoprics and benefices: and it is the more to be lamented that he should not have remembered this, inasmuch as in his *History of the Church*, he abundantly demonstrates (as our quotations have already shown), to what an extent the crown had exercised its influence over the episcopate ever since the days of Henry IV., and does ample justice to the great Pontiffs who waged with that wicked Emperor and with others, his successors, so stern a struggle upon that very question, knowing how vital it was to the interests of the Church. But the history of the century or two preceding the rise of Luther shows, (and for this very purpose we have adverted to it,) that the authority of the Holy See had now so much declined beneath the encroachments of the secular power, that it was not adequate to the redress of the evils it deplored, and against which Pontiff after Pontiff remonstrated in vain. In the view of Luther, however, which Dr. Dollinger presents, we read nothing of the efforts of Popes to reform the German Church, and in place of that we are told forsooth that Luther felt and deplored its abuses. Why he was a coarse and cunning railer against the Holy See, the only power that had striven to remove them. The truth is, that the origin of those abuses was the interference of the secular power with the affairs of the Church, and that Luther made himself a servile instrument of that power, and so far from feeling or deploring the abuses, did his utmost to perpetuate them and developed them into still greater. The evil was secular influence, and his whole aim was to place the Church under state power. The abuses arose from state patronage, and his remedy was state spoliation. Dr. Dollinger utterly ignores the antecedent facts of history, and the political aspect of the times with respect to the Papacy, and it is only by keeping all these out of sight that he reaches the extraordinary conclusion that Luther "deplored the abuses of the Church, and had the sympathy of well disposed persons!" We shall see who were his sympathizers.

Such were the circumstances under which, in 1516, Leo proclaimed special indulgences, which were to be preached




in Germany ; their produce was to be devoted towards the completion of the Church of St. Peter, which Julius had been unable to finish. It was the cathedral of Christendom, the Seat of St. Peter's successors, and to any but the most sordid minds, had a claim on the charity and generosity of the faithful, which amply justified the appeal to their piety. And if it be said, as it was said by men of sordid minds, that the funds of the Papacy were sufficient for the purpose, the answer is afforded in the facts of antecedent history, to which we have adverted. The funds of the Papacy would have been sufficient had they not been diminished to the utmost possible extent by princely rapacity, and exhausted by the struggles in which the Holy See had been unavoidably involved with the rest of Italy, in defence of its patrimony against unprincipled invaders. For many generations, on the one hand, the Papacy had been systematically deprived of its ancient and accustomed dues, and, on the other hand, Italy had been a scene of warfare, owing to the efforts of the emperors to enslave it, and for a long course of years by the rivalry of France and Germany. And at this very time Albert, the Archbishop of Mayence, owed the Pope some large sums for the usual fee upon the pallium.

At Rome it was the custom of the chancery to dispose in each Catholic state of the right to proclaim and distribute those special indulgences, and Albert was commissioner for all Germany. Probably had he and his suffragans paid those fees which were by ancient usage due to the Holy See, there would have been no necessity for the indulgences. It is of course useless to explain them to Catholic readers, but for the sake of any Protestant readers it may be as well to say that the Catholic faith teaches, what they probably would not in theory dispute, that charity is a duty, and that one branch of it is the support of sacred edifices; and that the erection of a cathedral at Rome, at the special instance of the Holy Father, would be a very fitting opportunity for its exercise. Further, that these indulgences, (as to which they may read the authentic documents in the Appendix to Audin's History,) operated simply as applications of this general duty of almsgiving to the special purpose in question, and secured to its exercise that efficacy which the Catholic faith teaches, may be attached to it by the authority of the Church, provided it is exercised after sacramental confes-

sion with true and sincere penitence, and firm faith in the infinite merits of the Redeemer.

Tetzel, who was appointed to preach the Papal indulgences in Germany, was no ignorant monk. He was a theologian of thirty years standing, and was one of the most distinguished lights of his order. Before commencing his labours, he printed an *instruction on the duties of the preacher of indulgences*, and he carefully inculcated the necessity of sincere repentance and sacramental confession, in order to obtain pardon, and give effect to the indulgences. Such, also, was the tenor of the commission published by the archbishop, and which likewise may be seen in the Appendix to the work of Audin. The simple terms of these documents must serve to dissipate a host of vulgar prejudices. “Whoever, *having confessed and being penitent*, shall buy the alms, shall obtain full remission of his sins.” It is unnecessary to say that this ever had been, is now, and ever will be, the Catholic faith. And the prevalent notion as to Tetzel’s “abuses” is a loose idea, without the least foundation in fact. The misrepresentations of the Dominican teachers, put forth by Luther’s disciples, are monstrous and infamous. Had the work of Audin done no more than disclose the truth upon that head it would have done great service.

The difficulty of fixing upon the preaching of the Papal indulgences by Tetzel any abuse, is so great, that there have not been wanting those who have endeavoured to make out a case on the ground of misapplication of the monies procured. Obviously this would either involve an admission of the validity of indulgences, or it would be wholly idle and immaterial. And, be it observed, that Luther, in his propositions, made no such charge of misapplication, which is relinquished by really learned and candid Protestant writers. Thus Roscoe does not controvert that the real motive of soliciting the aid of the Christian world, by the sale of indulgences, was for the purpose named in the brief itself, the completion of the immense fabric of St. Peter, begun on so magnificent a scale by Julius II. Roscoe also candidly admits “that there was not any novelty in the method adopted by Leo of obtaining a temporary aid to the revenues of the Church by the dispensation of indulgences, it being certain that these measures had been resorted to as early as the year 1100, when Urban II. granted a plenary indulgence to all who



should join in the crusades to liberate the sepulchre of Christ from the hands of the infidels.'''* We need scarcely say, that according to the usual fallacy of Protestants, the period at which any sacrament, doctrine, or practice is first mentioned in history, is here assigned absurdly enough as the period of its original rise or institution. Still the passage is an admission that for four hundred years these Papal indulgences had been preached in Germany. And Audin points out that the church of All Saints in Wittenberg, (where the Elector of Saxony had founded his new university,) had been visited by the faithful from all parts of Germany ever since 1398, when Pope Boniface granted an indulgence to all who should communicate at its altar. Nor is this all, for Audin adds, that the Elector having exhibited some interest in this Church, Leo X. had, in 1516, conceded, most probably on the solicitation of the prince himself, further indulgences to the faithful who should visit it. Surely, then, facts raise an inference *à priori* that any opposition on the part of this prince, or of any German prince, to the preaching of Papal indulgences, must really have been stimulated by jealousy as to the application of the money. No Catholic need be told that to every plenary indulgence it is a condition that alms shall be given. No objection was entertained to indulgences of which the alms were devoted to *local* objects. The real objection was to indulgences which operated in favour of the Roman treasury.

Well, Tetzel came to Saxony, *and the Elector refused to receive him*. This was Luther's country, and the Elector was his immediate sovereign, and, as we shall see soon, became his protector. Who was emperor we have seen, and he also, we shall see, was prepared to encourage Luther. The Elector gave the monk the hint. And the admirers of Luther can as little claim for him the merit of originality as of courage. He did but echo the voice of his prince, backed by all the power of the empire, and great masses of the people. In the latter end of 1517, Tetzel came to the neighbourhood of Wittenberg, where Luther was. The latter saw his time had come. Remember these were *papal* indulgences which were being preached, and remember the feeling which pervaded

* Rosc. Life of Leo X. p. 91.

princes and people of Germany against the Papacy. By attacking the indulgences he knew he should please his prince, the Elector of Saxony; he would *not displease* his sovereign, the emperor; and if he did it in a tone of boldness, and with an air of audacious coarseness, he was certain to please a great part of the people. He had everything to gain, and nothing to fear. If he desired, as we suspect, and the sequel shows, release from monastic vows, this might serve his purpose, like a malefactor would fire his prison in the hope of escaping amidst the conflagration. Anyhow, proud, sensual, restless, he had a good chance of notoriety, princely favour, popular applause, and ambition and the worser passions were certain of gratification. The Diet of Mentz, held in this very year, re-echoed the old complaint of secular princes, that “the wealth of the country found its way to Rome.” And “on that hint he spoke.” This was the scope of the celebrated “propositions” against the Papal indulgences, which he posted up on the 1st November, 1517, on the doors of the church of All Saints, Wittenberg. Let it be recollected, in passing, that the university of Wittenberg, in which Luther was professor, had been, a few years before, founded by the Elector of Saxony, who had just refused to admit the preachers of the papal indulgences into his electorate. Ranke himself confesses that “*an alliance had been formed between the monk of Wittenberg and the sovereign of Saxony.*”^{*} And very skilfully were the “propositions” framed to propitiate the secular princes, and pander to the vulgar German prejudices against the Papacy, which for centuries had been fostered by a prelacy too much under the influence of princely patrons, and by a clergy whom they had done so much to corrupt.

“Bishops and clergy have the *same power* in purgatory as the Pope has.” “Why does not the Pope, who is richer than Cræsus, *build St. Peters with his own money*, rather than with that of poor Christians?” “Christians should be taught that he who gives to the poor, or assists the needy, *does better* than he who purchases indulgences.”† There is consummate art in the adaptation of the “propositions” to the sordid jealousies and peculiar prejudices of each class, the princes or the

* Hist. Reform. A.D. 1517.

† Audin v. i. p. 93.

people, the clergy or the laity. And equal art is shown in the steering clear of any *direct* impeachment of the papal supremacy in the doctrine of indulgences, insomuch that Audin quotes a Protestant author, Schræch, who considers that neither of these dogmas was then disbelieved or disputed by Luther.”* If this be so, there never was a *safer* course to pursue, whether he believed these doctrines or not; and, on the latter hypothesis, he could scarcely have pursued a course less sincere, less courageous, or less ingenuous, since the whole tendency of his “propositions” was to bring doctrines into contempt, which if he believed he wanted honesty to adhere to, and if he disbelieved he wanted the courage to impugn. The last “proposition” is, “If indulgences were preached according to the meaning and intention of the Pope, it would be easy to answer these questions;” plainly implying that, according to the intention and meaning of the Pope, the preaching of his indulgences was right enough, but also implying what was absolutely untrue, that the preaching of Tetzel at all varied from the “meaning or intention of the Pope;” that it did not was soon seen, by Luther finding himself logically driven into a total denial of the doctrine of indulgences altogether, which at the outset he thus admitted or implied was, in itself, a sound doctrine. If honest in his *original* declarations, it is not easy to see the honesty of his subsequent contention.

In his reply to one of his antagonists, a venerable and scholar like priest, Luther betrayed the ruffianly spirit which lurked in him, and which rendered him so worthy of the sympathy and support of the robber-princes, whose hereditary policy it was to plunder the Papacy. He denounced Rome as the scarlet Babylon and the synagogue of Satan. He advised the emperor and the princes to hunt down Romanists like his antagonist, with the sword, and desired that he could wash his hands in the blood of cardinals and popes, and the nest of serpents brooding in the Roman Sodom.† Here again there could not be a safer theme

* Ib. 95.

† “Si fures furca si latrones gladio si hæreticos igne plectimur cur non magis hos magistros perditionis has cardinales hos papas et totum istam Romanæ Sodomæ colluviam quæ ecclesiam Dei sine fine corrumpet omnibus armis impetrinus et manus nostras in sanguine istorum lavamus.” Opera Luther, t. i. p. 60.

of scurrility than the Court of Rome (which like modern heretics, and some catholics, he had learnt doubtless to distinguish from the See of Rome), in an age and in a country bitterly opposed to that court, with all the hatred of the wrongdoer for the wronged—of baffled brigands for their rescued victims. Italy, thanks to the spirit and courage of Pontiffs such as Sixtus and Julius, had now, under Leo, attained something like tranquillity and repose, and the patrimony of the Holy See was protected from the incursions of unchristian invaders. But the princes whose schemes of spoliation had been defeated, hated the Pontiffs who had foiled them; and the brutal revenge which Luther suggested to Maximilian, as Savonarola had suggested to Charles VIII. of France, was one which they would have been happy to enjoy, and did enjoy, when a few years afterwards, the army of Charles V. of Germany sacked Rome, and perpetrated the atrocities which their apostle had suggested. Nor had he to wait so long for the *reception* if not the *realization* of his denunciations. The Protestant historian of the House of Austria has told us, that Maximilian, who was anxious “to reform the abuses and curb the encroachments of the Church,” (we have seen what the Emperor understood by such words,) “far from opposing the first attacks of Luther against indulgences, was pleased with his spirit and acuteness, declared that he deserved protection, and treated his adversaries with contempt and ridicule.”* To which we will add, repeating words of Ranke which we have already quoted, that the emperor recommended Luther to the Elector of Saxony, saying, that “there might come a time when he would be needed.”† On the other hand, Luther, with that mixture of artifice and truculence which characterized him, repeatedly deprecated any condemnation of his views, until his errors were clearly demonstrated. As that meant that his teaching was to be tolerated, not merely until its errors were in *his judgment* demonstrated, but until he *admitted* that they were so “demonstrated,” the professed readiness to be convinced was a pretence, while at the same time it tended to entrap the defenders of the faith into discussions and

* Coxe, vol. i. p. 387.

† Hist. of Popes, vol. i. p. 65.

disputations, in which he well knew the ignorant and the corrupt, the worldly-minded and the interested being judges, he should make the most powerful impression, and his heresy would meanwhile be diffused. Thus, in his rebellion against authority, he would be sure to find adherents, and his revolt from faith protectors. In May, 1518, he wrote to Staupitz and the Bishop, professing respect for the authority of the Church. Even Protestant writers appreciate the shrewdness of this course, while they are sensible to its insincerity. Thus Roscoe writes, "Declarations apparently so just and reasonable, gained him many powerful friends. Even his sovereign and great patron, the Elector of Saxony, seems to have considered this as a decisive proof of the rectitude of his views." In a letter which bears date, August, 1518, he says, "I am informed that he has always been ready to make his appearance before impartial and prudent judges, and to defend his doctrines, and that he owns himself ready on all occasions to submit to and embrace those more correct opinions, which may be taught him on the authority of the Holy See." In the account of Erasmus in which he seems to have suggested to Luther some of the leading points on which he ought more particularly to insist, we find the same sentiment repeated. It is also invariably referred to in the letters of Erasmus. "The papal bulls may have more weight," he says, "but a book filled with arguments derived from the sacred writings, and which pretends to teach only, and not to compel, will always be preferred by men of real learning, for a well-informed mind is easily led by reason, but does not readily submit to authority."* Here we see the pride of human learning and human reason opposed to infallible authority and faith. Erasmus lived long enough to see the folly and the fallacy of these views. And an intelligent Protestant like Roscoe could perceive and expose their insincerity. Plausible as this conduct may appear on the part of Luther, it must be confessed that its success was much beyond what might reasonably have been expected from it, and that it was, in fact, little more than a veil thrown over the eyes both of his enemies and friends. He only influenced however men who, like

* Life of Leo, vol. i. p. 10.

Erasmus, had their faith weakened by pride of human learning; or, like the Elector, had it destroyed by coarser passions of covetousness or lust.

The Elector and the university of Wittenberg which he had founded, had united in entreating of the Pope to dispense with Luther's personal appearance at Rome. Their reasons were obvious and were twofold. They desired not to suppress the heresy, and for the purpose of its diffusion, all that was necessary was discussion,—public discussion,—and perpetual appeal *ad populum*. How thereon could a revolt from authority be conducted? Its essence was an appeal to human pride against the infallible authority of the Church. Hence the policy of Luther was their policy, and the Pope, unsupported by the Emperor, was obliged to yield. Staupitz stipulated for public discussion. The legate reluctantly consented. Next day Luther presented him a written paper, so pregnant with the spirit of rebellion, that the Legate refused to receive it. He sent Staupitz to remonstrate with Luther. Apparently the remonstrances had effect; Luther wrote to the nuncio a letter full of protestations of obedience and reverence for Papal authority. That night he secretly and hastily quitted Augsburg, leaving a public notice that he had always declared that he would submit his opinions to the judgment of the Church and the supreme Pontiff; but that he appealed to the Pope.* Was there ever a greater combination of tergiversation and insolence; insincerity and truculence? If he was sincere in submission to authority, why not have yielded? If not—why shrink from openly impeaching an authority he would not yield to?

“Both parties might without any extraordinary sagacity have fancied that between an entire obedience to the Roman Church and a direct opposition to them there is no medium. To doubt the supreme authority of the Holy See in matters of faith: to call upon her to defend her doctrines by arguments—to assert those of a contrary tenor—to enforce them not only by reason and Scripture, but by sarcasm and abuse, and proudly to impeach the authority of the Church itself, was to throw off all obedience and to appear in open rebellion.”† The truth is plain, that Luther's was a rebellion against authority disguised

* Audin, vol. i. 140.

† Ib. 106.

by hypocrisy: a revolt from faith under the pretence of reason.

One serious and unaccountable error in the work of Audin, is his not noticing the encouragement given by the emperor to Luther: instead of which he actually asserts that Maximilian was the first to inform the Pope of the troubles that menaced Germany!*. On the contrary, as we have shown, he was the first to encourage the author of those troubles; and in July 1518, at the Diet of Augsburg, which he had summoned not to suppress the rising heresy but for political purposes—he tacitly sanctioned the infamous Hutten in circulating among the members a memorial describing the Pope as a more dangerous enemy to Christendom than the Turks, and charging the Court of Rome with having drained the States of Christendom by annates, reserves, tenths and other exactions.† Still the old story: a jealousy about *money*. This it was that rendered the Emperor indifferent about *heresy*. It was on August 7, 1518, that Leo cited Luther to Rome: and at the same time he instructed his Legate at the Court of Austria to urge the assistance of the emperor and the princes; and if Luther should disobey the citation, to confine him at once until further proceeding could be adopted. A similar letter was sent to the Elector of Saxony. They entirely disregarded the remonstrances of the apostolic father. Had they obeyed, the heresy of Luther would have been destroyed, or at least so obstructed in its diffusion, that in a few years it would have died out; and myriads of lives and millions of souls would have been saved. But what cared these selfish sordid princes for souls? What they were anxious about was, to prevent money from going to Rome, and they find Luther an admirable instrument for their purpose. They prefer, as he does, disputation. He is left to this. He is invited to attend before Cardinal Cajetan, the Pope's legate. He declines to do so without a safe conduct! a striking proof alike of consciousness of heresy and of absence of courage. Here was a man ready to set Germany in flames about what he pretended to believe to be

* p. 122.

6-14

† See Coxe, v. i. p. 379, where however the case is curiously misrepresented.

divine truth, and yet unwilling to take a step out of the dominions of his especial patron—his princely protector—without a safe conduct. The Emperor is ready enough to grant it; Luther attends before the legate, and declaring he would *not* dispute, disputed, professing his reverence for authority, he set it at nought. Why not? he had a safe conduct, and the Emperor encouraged him. His course was clear. Miltitz was one of those candid ecclesiastics who flatter themselves on their skill in conciliation and compromise: he professed to admit that there were “abuses” no doubt, in the preaching of indulgences, and censured Tetzel, whom he summoned before him. What he could have found to censure it is hard to see, as the documents given by Audin clearly show the monk’s preaching was sound and Catholic, and that his practice was inconsistent with it, no one pretends, nor can any difference between it and the present system of indulgences be perceived. When to aid in the building of a Catholic church an indulgence is promised, on the usual conditions, every Catholic knows that, presupposing those conditions, immediately on paying the prescribed alms, the indulgence takes effect, premising, we add, (*ex abundanti cautelo*) the proper disposition. This was all that Tetzel told the people, and this was all that Tetzel did, except that he gave tickets to denote the indulgences, which we conceive could no more affect the substance of the system than could the common practice of giving tickets at confirmation at all affect the administration of the sacrament. The censures upon poor Tetzel were most unmerited. The fact was, that he fell a victim to the coarse and cruel calumnies with which Luther covered him. And, in plain English, this and the censures together killed him. He died in July 1519. *Requiescat in pace*. He was a victim, and almost a martyr. Audin nobly vindicates him. Yet so uneradicable is the taint of that false candour, which is one of the vices of the age, that he permits to escape him, a loose admission about these mere “abuses” in the system of indulgences, after having triumphantly established that there were none;* that the system was in substance identically the same with our own at the present day. The Pope had

* Coxe v. i, 411.

in a Bull solemnly affirmed the doctrine of indulgences, exactly as it had been declared by the commission of the Archbishop of Mayence, and exactly as Tetzels had preached it. Luther had repeatedly declared that he would submit to the Holy See. He did not submit, but continued to dispute. It was not until after an interregnum of nearly six months that Charles V. was elected to the imperial throne, nor was it until nearly a year and a half afterwards (October 1520) he terminated the vicariate of Luther's patron, the Elector, and was crowned Emperor. Mr. Coxe himself states, that from the commencement of his vicarial authority, the Elector evinced such a partiality for the reformer, and his doctrines, as induced (i.e. obliged) the "Pope to suspend all proceedings for eighteen months." He need hardly have added, "During this interval, and under these favourable auspices, the new doctrine gained a wonderful ascendancy." The Protestant historian, however, also adds, what is more important, that the Pope used every effort suggested by moderation and good sense to put a stop to the heresy. His efforts were unaided by the state. Maximilian had written to the Pope a hypocritical letter, dated (August 5, 1518,) so inconsistent with his previous conduct, that its authenticity has been controverted, in which he professes his readiness to take steps to suppress the heresy. But although he lived six months longer, long after receiving the papal letter above referred to, he never caused Luther to be arrested and confined, as the Pope had earnestly desired him to do, in order at once to stop the progress of the heresy, but allowed discussions and disputations to continue, which only tended to fix it and diffuse it in the popular mind. The insincerity of the Emperor could not escape the observation even of a Protestant historian, and Mr. Coxe writes thus, "Notwithstanding the exhortatory letter of Maximilian, he seemed so little interested in the Lutheran controversy, that he dissolved the diet and quitted Augsburg two days before the arrival of the Saxon reformer."* "At this critical period, (November 1518) before the Papal Bull approving the doctrine of indulgences could reach him, the Emperor died, (Jan. 11, 1519,) and the government devolved on the Elector of Saxony "as head of the empire."† The Elector

* Coxe i. 391.

† Ib.

was the patron, sovereign, and the protector of Luther, and from that time the arch heretic felt himself safe; the proceedings against him were suspended, and he was left at liberty to prosecute the design he now, if not before, had fully formed, of emancipating himself from monastic restraints by destroying the authority of the Church. Miltitz, canon of Mayence, apostolic nuncio, entreated the Elector to arrest the progress of Luther, but in vain; and then the nuncio tried other discussions with the heretic, of course equally in vain. And as the Protestant historian himself observes, speaking of the discussion with Eck, (June, 1519): "Luther denied all authority except that of Scripture and reason, and urged the right of private judgment on all matters of faith;" and this single point, which, as Mr. Coxe truly says, was *flattering to the audience*, was the leading cause which undermined papal authority. How could it be otherwise? The restraints of authority are always irksome, and Luther proposed a religion which got rid of it.

Upon the accession of Charles, the arch-heretic, with an unparalleled effrontery and hypocrisy, addressed to him a letter, in which he pathetically complained of having been forced in spite of himself into the arena of public disputation, and repeated his old artifice, a promise of submission, when convicted, (that is on his own confession,) of heresy. In 1520 he had published his sermon on the Eucharist, which had been loudly denounced as heretical, and in an insolent letter to Leo X. propounded his heresy of justification by faith. The letter was dated 6th April; but its mixture of insolence and insincerity is so odious, that Protestant writers, and even Luther himself, ashamed of it, have sought to make out the date to have been 6th September, in order to show that it was subsequent to the Bull of excommunication issued by the Pope in June: and to plead that as a provocation. But Roscoe proves by irrefragable evidence that the true date of the letter was the 6th April, and as Audin observes, it is remarkable, that if written after the Bull it should not have alluded to it.* The Bull was dated 15th June, 1520. The Elector refused to enforce it; and when the Emperor convened the diet of Worms, partly "to concert with the princes of

the empire effectual measures for checking the progress of those *new and dangerous opinions which threatened to disturb the peace of Germany*,"* such measures were firmly opposed by the Electors of Saxony and Bavaria, and by many of the inferior nobility who had espoused the cause of Luther, and who by their representations as to the extension of the new opinions in Germany, and the number and distinction of their adherents, occasioned great apprehensions among the partisans of the Holy See."† The Diet itself displayed an evident disposition to form an attack on the pretensions and exactions of the Pope, and the states presented a long list of grievances against the Holy See, of which they required the Emperor to obtain redress."‡ The adversaries of the arch-heretic were intimidated by the reports of a league of four hundred German nobles, who were said to be ready to take up arms on his behalf."§ It was not until well aware of all this that Luther had the courage to adhere to his heresy before the diet; indeed at first he declined to do so; and although years had now elapsed, actually required time to deliberate. Reassured as to the support he should receive (he had already obtained a safe conduct), he refused to yield, and though the emperor desired to treat him as a heretic, he had not sufficient influence to do so,|| and the decree only declared him a heretic, and put him under the ban of the empire. How little reason Luther had to fear is apparent from what immediately followed, and which we prefer stating in the words of two Protestant historians: "In the meantime Luther had found a shelter against the approaching storm. As he was passing through a wood on his return to Wittenberg, he was seized upon by several persons *employed by the Elector of Saxony for that purpose*, and carried to the castle of Wurtburg, where he remained in great privacy during the remainder of the pontificate of Leo X."¶ "Luther had withdrawn from Worms, under a safe conduct for twenty-one days. The Elector of Saxony had devised means to shelter him from the impending storm

* 1 Coxe, 410.

† 2 Rosc. Leo X. 222.

‡ 1 Coxe, 416.

§ 2 Rosc. Life of Leo X. 229.

|| 1 Coxe, 418.

¶ 1 Coxe, 231.

without incurring the resentment of the Pope and the Emperor. Luther was seized by a troop of masked horsemen and conveyed to the castle of Wurtburg, where he remained for nine months, unknown even to his guards, and concealed from his friends and followers.”* “During the interval,” it is added, “he contrived to disseminate several writings, not only in defence of his former doctrines, but still further attacking the principles and ceremonies of the Church of Rome.” This was in direct defiance of the Imperial edict, which forbade the printing or publishing of his heresy. And could the Emperor have been ignorant of it? It is more likely that he *winked* at it; since it has not escaped the penetration of these historians, that “he was unwilling to offend the Elector of Saxony;”† and certainly it is not easy to perceive any indications of sincerity either in the heretic who had pretended reverence for the authority of the Church, until, protected by princes, he could assail it with impunity, or in the Sovereign who, professing zeal for the suppression of heresy, tacitly acquiesced in its diffusion. The heretic had done the work of the empire: the papal authority was extinct in Germany. Now for his reward. It was, emancipation from monastic vows, and especially from that of celibacy. While he was enjoying the luxuries of Wurtburg, his disciples were anticipating his example, and several monks of the monastery of Wittenberg, which had been corrupted for years by his evil influence, violated their vows of chastity. Thus the first fruits of heresy were sins of sensuality; pride and lust illustrated their intimate alliance; and those who had reviled the merciful doctrine of indulgences as leading to vice, lapsed into unlicensed self-indulgence, and let loose their passions. Bucer, after preaching against celibacy, carried off a nun, and Carlstadt married a female whom he had seduced; and Luther, bettered their example, vindicating his superiority by the double atrocity of seducing a nun and then marrying her.‡ Erasmus, who was in Germany at the time when Luther’s preaching against celibacy began to take effect, gives a dreadful picture of the result, in the demoralization of the religious of both

* 2 Rosc. Life of Leo. 419.

† 1 Coxe, 416.

‡ Audin, vol. ii. c. 17 c. 18.

sexes.* Meanwhile to make sure of the continued protection of the secular power, he did his utmost to promote the secularization of the religious orders he had thus debauched; and in some countries of Germany he succeeded.† The lure was too great for rapacious and irreligious princes to resist. “Fortunately for the reformation,” we read in the *History of the House of Austria*, “the emperor was prevented from executing the edict of Worms by his absence from Germany, and still more by the war with Francis I., which extended into Italy, and for above eight years involved him in a continued series of contests and negotiations at a distance from Germany.”‡ That it was not the absence of Charles from Germany which prevented him from executing the Edict of Worms, and suppressing Luther’s heresy, we have already seen from the fact that he did not take proper measures for that object when he was in Germany. And the contests in which he was involved were but the result of that same spirit of territorial aggrandizement, which had for so many ages led succeeding emperors on expeditions of conquest into Italy, and led them to disregard, or even to injure the interests of the Holy See. This spirit it was which now led Charles V. to prefer the prosecution of his warlike enterprises to the extirpation of heresy, and as we shall see, systematically to regard policy, rather than faith. Neither he nor France cared for the Church, and both connived at Protestantism for purposes of policy, until it had risen to a height at which it could no longer be suppressed.

Before Luther had quitted his retreat at Wurtzburg, Adrian was called to the Chair of St. Peter. “On a worthier man,” writes Ranke, “the choice of the conclave could scarcely have fallen. His reputation was without a blemish; laborious, upright, and pious; of an earnest gravity, yet benevolent withal; full of pure intentions; a true servant to religion.”§ In the distribution of benefices “he proceeded with scrupulous conscientiousness.”|| Well, had this excellent Pontiff, whom even calumny could not impeach, more success with the princes of the empire, or

* Sunt rursus qui invident opibus sacerdotum et sunt qui fit sua fortiter profundunt vino scortis et alea ita rapinis alienorum invidant. Erasmi. Ep. p. 766, cited in Audin, vol. ii. p. 181, in notes.

† Audin, vol. ii. 181.

‡ Vol. i. p. 421.

§ Hist. Popes, vol. i. 69.

|| Ib. p. 73.



with Luther, than preceding Popes? Not at all. His simple piety was disregarded. In vain he directed a brief to the Diet of Nuremberg (Nov. 1522) severely censuring the princes of the empire for not carrying into execution the edict of Worms: acknowledging at the same time the corruptions of the Church, and promising to do his utmost to remove them. This was not what the princes really required, because, as we have seen, the corruptions of the Church were the result of their abuse of its own patronage, and the only reforms they wished were those which heresy alone could furnish,—freedom from the restraints of religion, and from what they called the “exactions,” i. e., the ancient dues of the Apostolic See—from which heresy afforded the the easiest and speediest relief. They therefore declined to take any steps to suppress the heresy. Under Clement VI., the second Diet of Nuremberg (January 1524) pursued a similar course. Lutheranism was thus virtually sanctioned by the Diet. Luther, who had thrown off his monastic habit, now reduced his heresy into form, and established a new religion in Saxony. The new Elector publicly espoused it, as did Philip of Hesse and the chief of the imperial cities. The result was the association of Ratisbon on the part of the Catholic princes, and the counter-association of the Protestants at Torgan in 1521.

In the meantime Charles in Italy, while making vain protestations of his resolution to suppress Lutheranism, was pursuing the hereditary policy of the Emperors, and pressing forward schemes of aggrandisement, which drove the Pope, for the protection of his independence, to the Holy League. Let us remind our readers of the testimony of the illustrious Protestant writer we referred to at the outset, establishing that the independence of the Popes was essential to prevent the Church from becoming utterly enslaved, and religion from being degraded into a state function. The Emperor was irritated by the Holy League, which stopped his unprincipled aggression, and thus prompted him, writes the historian, “to humble the Holy See, and to promote the progress of the Lutheran doctrines.”* In a manifesto, published in reply to the apology of the Pope, the Emperor appealed to a general council, following the example of Luther. “This manifesto,” says the his-

* 1 Coxe, 430.

torian, "scarcely inferior in virulence to the invectives of Luther himself, being dispersed over Germany, was eagerly read by persons of all ranks: and together with the sack of Rome, (in 1527,) and the capture and imprisonment of the Pope, taught the Germans, by the example of their chief, to treat the papal authority with little reverence, and more than counterbalanced the proscription of the Lutheran doctrines."* "Thenceforth," wrote Ranke, "Charles was more powerful in Italy than any emperor had been for centuries." He had acted the part of Barbarossa, but with greater success, and realized the despotic aspirations of Henry IV. And now was practically illustrated the truth which Hurter has attested, that the independence of the Papacy is necessary to the freedom and integrity of the Church. When, in 1530, Charles was pleased to profess again his resolution to suppress Protestantism, he proposed to call a general council. Ranke perceives and approves his policy. "In the different complication of their interests with those of the Pontificate, the princes had ever desired to find some spiritual restraint for the Church. Charles might thus assure himself of most zealous allies in a council assembled under existing circumstances. Convened at his instigation, it would be held under his influence, and to him also would revert the execution of its decrees. How decided a preponderance would all this secure to the temporal power, above all to that of Charles himself."† In these words Ranke has vindicated the Papacy, confirming the testimony of Hurter, that the independence of the Holy See was necessary to the purity and safety of the Church. In attesting this, these Protestant writers have especially vindicated those Pontiffs who had immediately preceded the Reformation, and to whose conduct in respect particularly to their temporal position and possessions, Protestant writers are wont to ascribe the Reformation. On the contrary, the Reformation was the temporary triumph of the temporal over the spiritual, with a view to the utter enslavement of the Church, by means primarily of the imperial supremacy. Luther simply put into theory the practice of Barbarossa, and Charles, making Luther his instrument, followed the example of his predecessors, who had sought to trample upon the Holy

* *Ib.*† 1 Ranke's *Hist. Popes*, 87.

See. It was not a question of abuses in the Church, but of her enslavement. It was the very power that had produced these abuses which now was rampant, and as Ranke expresses it, the "Emperor was now preferring his claim under pretext of religious discussions, to an amount of preponderance in ecclesiastical affairs, such as no emperor had enjoyed for centuries."* It was this against which Gregory and Innocent had contended; it was this to prevent which Julius and Sixtus had struggled, and now their sagacity was shown and their policy vindicated by the event.

The Pope durst not call a council, because under imperial predominance it would not at present be free, and for fifteen years the Trentine council was postponed, to escape the domineering influence of the Emperor. Ranke acutely observes, "that the strength of the position to which the Protestants had now attained was this, that the Emperor could have no intention of subjecting them unconditionally to the Pope, because the agitations they occasioned were needful to him for the purpose of keeping the Pontiff in check."† "The Archbishop of Linden represented to the Emperor, that if his majesty would endure that the Lutherans should remain in their errors, he might dispose of all Germany at his will and pleasure."‡ The annals of iniquity exhibit no more shameless instance of depravity than this, of a prelate suggesting to a Catholic sovereign to tolerate heresy as a means of maintaining tyranny! No wonder that there were abuses in the Church; it is easy to see whence they arose. The existence of such men in the Church was in itself the most enormous abuse. And how came they there? Their very antagonism to the Papacy evinces that it was not to the Holy See they owed their elevation. Parasites of the secular princes, they sought to propitiate their patrons, and by their hostility to the Papacy vindicated it at least from any responsibility for the infamy of their own episcopacy. Abuses in the Church! How could abuses be redressed while such men remained? How could they be removed while these corrupt and worldly-minded princes retained their power over the Church patronage, and the temporal trample on the spiritual?

* Ib. 89.

† 1 Ranke (Hist. Popes,) 92.

‡ Ib. 127.

When at the second diet of Spires, (1529) the Lutherans appealed to a future council, they only followed the example of the Emperor, and it was idle in him to affect to be indignant at it. And when next year he assumed to convene a diet at Augsburg, "to consider the differences of opinion on the subject of religion, declaring it his intention to hear both parties, and examine their respective arguments; to correct and reform what required, in his opinion, to be corrected and reformed, that the truth might be known, and harmony re-established;"*—he was not merely, (to use an expression of Archdeacon Coxe,) "*scarcely less* heretical than Luther himself," but not one whit less so; under this insolent assumption of authority to examine into questions of doctrine and discipline, and not only decide what required to be corrected, but to determine what was theological truth, was the very essence of the Protestant heresy, which consists in setting up secular power against spiritual, private judgment against infallible authority, reason against faith. What mission had Charles, any more than Luther, to declare "the truth?" Indeed, he had not *so much* of mission, for he was a mere layman, whereas Luther was at least a priest. Besides, discussion was just what Luther wanted. When the diet was assembled, Charles himself, as Archdeacon Coxe writes, "clearly saw *the absurdity* as well as the danger of allowing the two parties to discuss intricate questions which could never be decided, and would only tend to increase their discordance."† In convening the diet he had conceded the principle of Lutheranism; and in receiving the "confession of Augsburg," which was its first formal affirmative declaration, he made in reality no further concession, although it was one which virtually recognized the heresy he affected to desire to destroy.

"Thus terminated," writes the Protestant historian, "a transaction which fully unfolded the duplicity of Charles, whose conduct was a series of frauds, dissimulation, and artifice."‡ He published a decree, indeed, by which the doctrines and usages of the Church were to be re-established, and the suppressed convents, and all ecclesiastical property, which had been alienated, were to be restored; but events had shown his indifference and insincerity, and

* Coxe i. 435.

† Ib. 439.

‡ Ib. 441.

the capricious princes, who had profited by the spoliations which had been perpetrated under pretence of "reformation," resolved to resist restitution and retain their plunder. Before the diet of Spires, Philip, the Landgrave of Hesse, "a prince," remarks Mr. Coxe, "perhaps sincere in his attachment to the new religion, but violent, ambitious, and interested, collected troops, and after alarming all Germany by threats, commenced aggression by invading the territories of the bishops of Wurtzburg and Bamberg."* As to this great supporter of the heretic it is unnecessary to add anything to this Protestant testimony. Albert, Margrave of Brandenburg, Grand-Master of the Teutonic Order, apostatized, that he might rob the order of the country of Prussia, which he erected into a hereditary principality.† Franz von di Mengen, imitating the example of Philip of Hesse, invaded the archbishopric of Trèves, at the head of a myriad of bandits, and ravaged it with fire and sword.‡ As to Luther's especial patron, the Elector of Saxony, Audin observes that he was an excellent hand at robbing a monastery.

In the pages of Ranke we find irrefragable evidence that the progress of the "Reformation" was merely a progress of pillage and spoliation, of which reformation was only the pretence. Prussia, he says, had given the first example of secularizing the Church property on a grand scale; this was followed by Livonia, in 1561.§ "No convent could maintain itself."|| "The canons in nearly all the bishoprics were either attached to the reformed tenets, or were but lukewarm and indifferent Catholics. What should prevent them from proposing Protestant bishops, should their doing so appear to them advantageous in other respects? It was then that a prince of Brandenburg obtained the archbishopric of Magdeburg,—a prince of Lanenburg that of Bremen, and a prince of Brunswick that of Halberstadt. The bishopric of Lubec also, with those of Verden and Minden, fell into the hands of Protestants, as did the abbey of Quedlenburg. The confiscation of Church property proceeded with proportionate rapacity. How important were the losses sustained, for example, in a very few years by the bishopric of Augsburg! All the convents of Wirtemberg were wrested

* lb. 432. † Audin v. ii. 189. ‡ Ibid. § i. 396. || 401.

from it in 1557. These were followed in 1558 by the convents and parishes of Oettingen. In Nordlingen and Memmengen the convents and parochial benefices were lost.* Thus Ranke quite confirms the account given by Audin; and does not this confirm our argument, that the Reformation was a secular, not a religious movement,—that religion had nothing to do with it, that it spread itself simply through the temptations held out by its lawlessness and licensed spoliation,—that in short it was a system of pillage and rapine, its pretence reform,—its real purposes plunder,—and its lure, a participation in the spoils?

The secularization of the monks, says Audin, was one of the great measures contrived by the Reformer to destroy Catholicism; it was necessarily followed by the spoliation of the religious houses.† He quotes Melancthon, who admitted that, in the triumph of the Reformation, the German princes had in view profane and earthly interests,—seizing the treasures of the cloisters, and the spoils of the Church.‡ And even Luther himself affirmed that the *ostensoria* or *monstrances* of the Church had made many conversions.§ Yet he had himself prompted them to seize the property of the monasteries,—of course, as in the case of England, under specious pretexts of a “useful” application, but with the *reality* of the most iniquitous confiscation. They did but develope his teaching, and “bettered the example” of the Emperor, who, true to the hereditary policy of the imperial court, had connived at the heresy as his predecessor had done, from feelings of jealousy towards the Holy See, and from a wish to stop the collection of any money for its treasury. Thus it was that indulgences were allowed to be impeached, because they formed a branch of the Papal revenues; and the Emperor’s arms had carried into the Eternal City the same sword of pillage which the ruthless princes carried into the German monasteries. The same spirit actuated the emperor and the princes,—a sordid spirit of avarice, which, in them found one scene or mode of manifestation, in him another, but rendered all equally indifferent to reli-

* 402.

† Ib. 179.

‡ Ib. 186.

§ Ib. 189.

gion, and disposed to favour heresy for the sake of plunder or of policy.

Audin quotes the German historian, Arnold, to show instances in which the citizens or the princes plundered religious houses.* In Stralsund, for instance, the citizens expelled the monks, and the duke seized the goods they had been forced to abandon. At Magdeberg the council of the magistrates decreed that the monks, during their lives, should remain in their cells, and continue to be supported at the expense of the house, on condition that they would throw off their religious habit and embrace the Reformation. Hunger, says Audin, made numerous apostates, and such were the victories recorded by the "Reformers."† What were they but robbers? What difference was there between unlicensed pillage by the war, and regular plunder by the authorities? Audin cites the testimonies for the facts he states, and states that Plank and other Protestant historians have given long details of the spoliation of the religious houses.‡ All this was quite in conformity with the example and policy of the emperor. What distinction was there between the princes plundering the property of the Church in Germany, and himself invading and ravaging the patrimony of the Holy See in Italy? In perfect consistency, therefore, with his previous conduct was his ratification of the treaty of Nuremberg, (1531) by which the Protestants were allowed the free exercise of their religion until a rule of faith was settled by a General Council, (or a diet of the empire!) and meanwhile they were to retain the alienated Church goods and lands.§ When, two years afterwards, he attempted to maintain the duty of restitution of ecclesiastical property, Philip of Hesse immediately resumed arms, and the Protestant princes renewed their confederacy,|| until Charles agreed to another truce, in consequence of which, to use the language of Archdeacon Coxe, "Germany for some time remained in a state of dubious peace." "From the edict of Worms," he continues, "Charles had either granted or withheld liberty of conscience," (that is, had tampered with or sought to trample on Lutheranism), "he was on friendship or at enmity

* v. ii. 194.

† 195.

‡ *Ib. in notis.*

§ Coxe i. 442.

|| *Ib.* 444.

with the Pope or the Turk!" This, which is perfectly true, speaks significantly as to the unprincipled conduct of the emperor. We will give in the Protestant historian's words a description of one of the events which followed the treaty of Marenberg. "Herman, Elector and Archbishop of Cologne, had embraced the Reformation, and encouraged its introduction among his subjects. This example held forth to the ecclesiastical princes the prospect of retaining possession of their dominions, and of acquiring independence, and a temporal sovereignty by embracing and encouraging the new doctrines."* Apprehensive for the interests of the empire Charles now made that resort to arms which he would not have made for the sake of religion, and when, after succeeding in crushing the Protestant league, he reassembled a diet at Augsburg, and had the power if he pleased, of restoring the Church to the position she had lost,—he was diverted from the great work by his dishonest designs, for the wresting of Parma and Placentia from the Holy See. No wonder that in the "Interim" the restoration of alienated Church property was again waved. It would have been a most obvious inconsistency for the emperor, who was busy in new plans of aggression on the Patrimony of the Holy See in Italy, to assert any scruples as to the confiscation of Church property in Germany. When, however, he had wrested Placentia from the Pope, the inconsistency was actually exhibited; for, on his reassembling the diet at Augsburg, he demanded full power to determine relative to the restitution of ecclesiastical property! It was rational enough that such conduct should excite mingled indignation and disgust against the Emperor; and, despite the injurious results to religion, it is difficult to repress feelings of satisfaction, in contemplating the disastrous campaign, which drove him into the ignominious treaty of Passau, by which Protestantism was again temporarily recognized. "From this period," says Coxe, "fortune forsook him, and almost all his enterprises failed of success."† At the third diet of Augsburg, (1555) held to confirm the treaty of Passau, Protestantism was finally established, and the diet not only did not decree the restitution of Church

* Ib. 446.

† p. 472.

property, but declined to direct that prelates, or other ecclesiastics, should relinquish their benefices and temporal possessions in the event of their abjuring the Catholic faith!—a course which fixes indelibly the brand of dishonesty on the promoters of the “Reformation,” and held out a direct and sordid inducement to all ecclesiastics to abandon their compact for the sake of secularizing their territories, securing at the same time the right to marry, and to transmit the Church property to their heirs.* It is true that the emperor, by a subsequent reservation, declared that ecclesiastics on becoming Protestants should vacate their benefices; but this, as not having been sanctioned by the diet, was never received as of equal force with the “recess” itself, and the emperor’s own example so stamped his “reservation” with inconsistency, that it had little moral power in the empire, especially as the “recess,”—the decree of the diet—declared Protestantism a recognized and protected religion.

It is not surprising that after this the Pope (Paul IV.) should have threatened the emperor with excommunication, if he did not declare the “recess” null and void. This, as Archdeacon Coxe admits, was on account of the recognition of Protestantism,† not on account of the question as to Church property which, indeed, was left untouched in the “recess” itself, and was for the future protected so far as the emperor was concerned, by the “reservation.” It is obvious that the anxiety of the Holy See was not as to property, but as to heresy; and it is equally obvious upon the testimony of this eminent Protestant historian, that the remorse of the emperor at the result of his dishonest connivance at the progress of Lutheranism, occasioned his retirement from the imperial dignity. The diet was opened in February, (1555) and the “recess” was scarcely ratified before he resolved (April 1555) upon the resignation of his crown. (1556). Luther had been dead nearly ten years, but Lutheranism was now firmly established, and mainly by reason of the agency, or the insincerity of Charles and his predecessor in the empire.

Looking back again over the history of the few past years, it is impossible not to see that the power of the

* Ib. 475.

† p. 478.

emperor had paralyzed the Holy See. When (1548) he published his "Interim," the Pope (Paul III.) found it, as was natural, (so Ranke himself expresses it*) intolerable, that the emperor should prescribe a rule of faith; but, however earnestly he complained of that, or of Church property being left in the hands of its present (Protestant) possessors, the emperor remained immovable, though Cardinal Farnese declared that in the Interim he could point out several heresies. †

In the affair of Placentia, Charles was impenetrable to any appeal to justice, though it was clearly the property of the Holy See, and had been frequently guaranteed by treaty; and thus the Emperor set the example at once of an encouragement of heresy and the perpetuation of spoliation. Let it be remembered that Luther was now dead, but his had never been otherwise than the subordinate part in the establishment of Protestantism; he had been merely the instrument and tool of princes, sordid, rapacious, and irreligious; his death made no difference; the *Emperor*, not *Luther*, was the main promoter of the heresy. And as Ranke himself tells us: "There ever rose before the Pope, the formidable power of the Emperor, whose influence he dreaded, more especially in ecclesiastical affairs." ‡ The same historian also describes the injuries and insults inflicted (mainly through the agency of the Emperor) on the oppressed Pontiff who broke his heart, adding another to the many Popes killed by the brutality of secular princes. His successor, Julius III., felt the effects of the same fatal influence. He decreed the re-assembling of the Council of Trent (1553) declaring that he did so without compact or condition. At the commencement of 1552, however, he found that "efforts were making under the auspices of the Emperor, to deprive him of his authority, that the Spanish bishops sought to reduce the chapters to a state of servile subjection on the one hand, while they desired to deprive the Holy See of the presentation to benefices on the other." § We are quoting Ranke. ¶ "But he affirmed to resolve to endure no invasion of his rights; under the title of an "abuse" he would not permit those

* Vol. i. p. 201.

† Ibid.

‡ v. i. p. 201.

§ P. 209.

prerogatives to be torn from him, which were no abuse but an essential attribute of his legitimate power." The result was, that the Council was broken up for the present.

Remembering the testimony of Hurter that the independence of the Holy See was essential to the freedom of the Church, and necessary to prevent religion from becoming degraded to a state function—how is it possible to think that the Pope could have acted otherwise? or how can it be wondered at, that after this he made no more vain efforts to struggle against the despotic power of the Emperor, who was resolved, by means of his tools in a council, to seek to enslave the Church? The evil results of the system of patronage, against which so many Pontiffs had contended, was now apparent, and proved the main obstacles to a settlement of doctrine and discipline; the Sees were filled with courtly prelates, instruments of the Emperor, and the Pope dreaded to convene the council for fear of an Erastianism which was already too powerful. Paul IV. had just ascended the papal throne before the Emperor's abdication, and Ranke describes him as acknowledging no other duty than the restoration of the Catholic Faith to all its primitive authority.* "We do promise and swear," he said in the little that he published on his accession to the Holy See, "to make it our first care that the reform of the Universal Church and of the Roman Court be at once entered on."† "He appointed," adds Ranke, "a congregation for the promotion of reforms in general." "The articles to be discussed by them in relation to the appointments to clerical offices and collations to benefices, were to be submitted to the universities." This again is significant (as we have already observed) of the seat and source of the abuses:—the local prostitution of patronage, an evil which two centuries before, the Holy See had urged provincial churches to correct, and which, without their co-operation, it could not correct, by reason of the restrictions placed upon its power over the administration of church patronage. Ranke states, with characteristic mixture of truth and falsehood, error and candour, "It is manifest that the new Pope proceeded with great earnestness in the work of reform. The spiritual tendency which had hitherto affected the

* V. i. p. 213.

† Ib. 214.

lower ranks of the hierarchy alone *now* seemed to gain possession of the papal throne itself;”* as if the very reverse were not the fact! as if for centuries the lower ranks of the hierarchy had not been the chief cause of the abuses locally existing; as if the successive Pontiffs had not for centuries been in vain urging them to redress these abuses! as if the present Pope was doing anything which had not been done before over and over again; and as if these reiterated labours had not proved abortive, through the corruptions of the lower ranks of the hierarchies, by the perversion of Church patronage by princes.

Hardly however had he ascended the papal throne before he was involved in war with the Catholic enemies of the Holy See. He had always affirmed that Charles favoured the Protestants from jealousy of the Pope, that the successes of the heretics were attributable to no other than the Emperor, and he “freely called his imperial majesty a favourer of heretics and schismatics.”† It was now the Emperor’s son who assailed him with hereditary inveteracy; and the pontiff declared him descended of a race who had ever desired to destroy the Holy See.‡ The Emperor had commenced hostilities against the new Pope from resentment at having been elected without regard to his influence;§ and after the Emperor’s abdication his son continued the same policy. In the contest which ensued, which was only a continuance of the old contest for the possession of Italy, the Pontiff nobly maintained the independence and integrity of the Holy See, and that he did so from the purest motives, is plain from the account which Ranke gives of the zeal and energy with which he pursued the work of reform so soon as hostilities were at an end.|| Nor were his reforms confined to the mere abolition of abuses. “Not content with a negative effect only,” writes Ranke, “he proceeded to practical amendments. He permitted no day to pass without the promulgation of some edict tending to restore the Church to its original purity.” Ranke quotes an Italian historian, who declares “this Pontiff proceeded so gravely and with so much dignity in the divine cause, that he seemed a worthy Vicar of Christ, and in matters of religion greater

* Ib. 215.

† Ib. 216.

‡ 227, in notes.

§ P. 217.

|| p. 232.

diligence could not be desired ;”* and quotes another, who speaks of “the incredible gravity and grandeur in all his actions.”†

His successor, Pius IV., was a Pontiff who proceeded in the same spirit. “Affairs, spiritual and temporal, were conducted with due attention to the interests of the Church, and the work of reform was not neglected.”‡ The Protestant historian immediately adds as an instance, “Pius admonished the bishops publicly to reside in their dioceses.” Here again it is obvious that it was not abuses, but reforms which emanated from Rome. The abuses were mainly local, the remedy came from Rome. It had been urged for centuries ; that it was accepted so tardily was not the fault of the Holy See. It was the fault of the secular princes, whose thoughts were intent, not on the reform, but on the plunder of the Church. The sequel shows this as strongly as the past. Pius IV. (1562) reassembled the Council of Trent. “Without doubt,” says Ranke, quoting an historian who does not usually (as he observes) take part with this Pontiff, “his boldness in this matter gave proof of all the zeal that was to be expected from so exalted a pastor, and neglected nothing that could forward so holy and needful a work.”§ But what followed ? The Spanish prelates mooted whether the residence of bishops in their dioceses was by divine command ; but maintained that episcopal authority had its origin immediately from God. As Ranke observes, “this struck at the very root of the whole ecclesiastical system ;” establishing the independence of subordinate grades of the hierarchy, as far as the Pope was concerned ; admitting of a complete subordination to the power of the secular sovereign, by reason of the system of patronage against which the Pontiff had for centuries struggled as the source of all abuse. Neither these princes nor their subservient prelates desired the exercise of the pontifical power for the extirpation of these abuses ; and hence, when the Holy See was once more labouring with that object, they united to thwart its efforts by establishing the independence of the national hierarchies as regarded the Pope. And the

* P. 233, in notes.

† P. 213, in notes.

‡ P. 247.

§ P. 249.

Emperor, with the same views, actually demanded that the council should reform the Popedom, that clerical celibacy should be abolished, and that the monasteries should be reformed; the last, as Ranke satirically remarks, for this special reason, that their great wealth might not be expended in so profligate a manner.* This was obviously a revival of those schemes of secularization of the monastic property which Luther had suggested, and which had led the princes to support him. It is impossible to believe that such suggestions from such sources were inspired by sincere desire to reform the religious orders. It is, on the contrary, abundantly attested that the Holy See was sincere, and found itself obstructed by the local hierarchies and the secular powers.

And under its auspices the council proceeded, and the important canons respecting clerical ordination and indulgences, in fact, all the principal measures of reform adopted by the assembly were decided on in the last three sessions of 1563. The Pope complained that the Spanish and the imperial bishops had been his principal opponents, and Ranke explains the reason. The king, holding the nomination of bishops himself, had a personal interest in the extension of episcopal authority. This indicates significantly the real source of all the difficulties in the way of reform. The most rigid performance of their duties was enjoined on the bishops, more especially of that involving the supervision of the clergy. This was precisely what the Popes had been inculcating for six centuries past. It was the subject of the struggles of Pontiffs with the emperors of the Swabean line, and the object of reiterated remonstrances since the accession of the house of Hapsburgh, especially during the last two centuries. And all the canons of the Council of Trent as to discipline, were directed to the extirpation of local abuses, which had grown up since the Papal power over provincial churches had been restrained, and chiefly had arisen from the corruption of the clergy through the abuse of local patronage. Repeatedly had the sessions of the council been interrupted by the aggressions of the secular princes, especially the Emperor, on the Holy See, and its labours had been prolonged and obstructed by the interested opposition of the

* P. 251.

provincial hierarchies, under the influence of the princes who held the patronage in their hands. And it was wholly owing to the zeal and wisdom of the Apostolic See, and entirely against the influence of the secular power, that in 1563 the council brought its long labours to a successful close.

The moment it was closed, the Holy See eagerly availed itself of the powers it had gained for the purpose of effecting the reforms it had so long struggled to introduce. Its decrees were immediately sent to the ecclesiastical courts of Germany, and were brought before the diet held at Augsburg in 1566. Mark the result, as stated by Ranke. "This was the first diet in which the Catholic princes opposed an effectual resistance to the Protestant demands. The Pope's exhortation found attentive listeners, and in a special assembly of the ecclesiastical princes, the decrees of the Council of Trent were provisionally accepted."* Once more, we ask, what was the result? We will again answer in the words of Ranke. "A new life may be said to have commenced from this moment in the Catholic Church of Germany." A new life, the result of the labours of the Holy See. "These decrees were gradually published in the provincial synods." "The most rigid visitation of the churches commenced, and the bishops, who had hitherto been extremely negligent, now displayed the utmost zeal and devotion." This testimony is most important for the vindication of the Papacy, and the condemnation of the so-called "Reformation." It proves what we have all along been contending, that the abuses of the Church were to be ascribed not to the Holy See, but to the neglect and decline of its authority, and that their reform proceeded not from the secular princes, the promoters of the pretended reformation, but from the Holy See itself. These reforms were those which the Holy See had been urging on the empire and its hierarchies for centuries, and which had been resisted by the interested opposition of the emperors and the hierarchies. They were reforms which, had the Holy See been obeyed, would have been effected six centuries before, and to effect which the Holy See had found it necessary to convene a council to support its power, by securing the co-operation of the hierarchies,

and thus enable itself to enforce the decrees which it caused to be passed. "Thus it was," writes Ranke, "that Catholicism, which might have been thought conquered, once more arose in Germany with renewed strength."* Luther had scarcely been dead a quarter of a century before Lutheranism began to decline. And it declined so soon as the Papal power obtained the ascendancy over the Imperial, and by the aid of a council enforced its decrees.

The remainder of Ranke's "History of the Popes" is occupied with describing the reaction against Protestantism, and the triumphs of revived Catholicism. We have purposely confined ourselves chiefly to *Protestant* historians, that we might at once confirm the authority of Audin, and from unimpeachable testimony supply his deficiencies. He is deficient principally in respect to that which has formed the subject of our argument, the political character of Lutheranism. But if Audin is deficient in this, Dr. Dollinger is far more so. That which in Audin indeed is defective, in Dollinger is absent. We speak especially of the abridged life of Luther, a little work, not less important however because it is little, and in one sense nothing that comes from the pen of such a writer can be little. The abridgement was, we understand, executed under his own care, and certainly does justice to the larger work. And as Dr. Dollinger permits himself to speak of Audin's Life as written with great ignorance of "the whole state of Germany at the time," we venture to remark that, on the contrary, it is written with greater reference to the state of Germany than Dr. Dollinger's. We avoid saying "with greater *knowledge*" of it; for of want of knowledge we will not accuse Dr. Dollinger, but certainly he has not used his knowledge in this respect so well as the writer he accuses of "ignorance." He wholly ignores that which we have endeavoured to show was the main motive, the real origin and cause of the movement called the Reformation; viz.: the sordid views and interested schemes of the German Princes, of whom Luther made himself for a selfish purpose the servile tool. Scarcely a quarter of a century was necessary to expose the true character of the Lutheran heresy. From its origin it had proved itself less a heresy than a rebellion.


* P. 430.

It was a revolt from faith for the purposes of lust and rapine. It did not originate in any objection to doctrine, for in its origin no doctrine was distinctly impugned. Neither did it arise from impatience at abuse, for it, instead of specifying abuses, resorted to calumnies, and arose at the very period when a council had been convened for the reformation of discipline, and a series of Pontiffs succeeded in the Apostolic Chair, zealous for the restoration of an apostolic spirit. It had nothing spiritual in its nature, for from the first it was characterized by an anxious and artful subserviency to the secular power, and propitiated its support and procured its aid by crafty schemes of spoliation and pillage. It was in its essence destructive; it was merely as an after thought, and as a sort of necessity, that it set up a sort of religious system of its own, to fill up the dreary waste of unbelief it had created. And having no foundation in faith, that system crumbled away, or became a cold and lifeless skeleton, so soon as the secular power, satiated by spoliation, ceased to cherish it. And, on the other hand, no sooner was the Church liberated from the pressure of the secular power, than she effected those reforms which, but for that pressure, she would centuries before have carried out, and which she had vainly urged upon the secular power and the local hierarchies to admit. And thus, hardly had the heretic's great patron been laid in his grave ere Catholicism began to revive, and the scene of his blasphemies became the theatre of her triumphs. His was but a revival of the heresy of Huss;—as the Bohemian heretic did but put into theory the rude despotism of Barbarossa, so the Saxon made himself a useful instrument of an emperor who imitated the barbarity and surpassed the hypocrisy of his predecessors; an emperor who, like them, invaded Italy, robbed the Holy See of its patrimony, and sought to enslave the Church to his despotic will. Luther in short was but the tool of a tyrant, whose bad passions he pandered to, that he might indulge his own. His principles spread rapidly, for they were the principles of self-indulgence, taught monks to lust and princes to commit rapine. But having no root of religious feeling, no basis of belief, they could not long sustain a religious aspect, could not resist the first shock of revived Catholicism, and speedily degenerated into rationalism, so that Lutheranism, which has no principle really in it but that of revolt from the

authority of the Holy See, has verified the sage aphorism of Hurter, and vindicated the very authority against which it revolted, by exhibiting in itself a proof that a religion separated from the Holy See must inevitably become like paganism, a mere state function.

ART. II.—*Food and its Adulterations, comprising the Reports of the Analytical Sanitary Commission of the Lancet.* By ARTHUR HILL HASSELL, M.D. London: Longmans, 1855.

IT is impossible to read the earlier writers upon country management and domestic economy, without perceiving that each household prepared almost every thing for itself, and also without having a feeling of envy at the apparent picture of rural felicity that such a mode of management presents. The ox and the swine that, when salted, afforded the winter staple food, were not only raised and fattened, but cured upon their owner's land; the sheep and poultry that supplied food in summer had also been brought up by their possessor; the "coney" and game, the latter invariably caught by what are now termed poaching practices, were furnished by the fields or the adjacent common; the brook yielded trout and chub, the fishponds carp, tench, eels, &c., (for until comparatively lately, owing to the slowness of locomotion and transit, save within a few miles of the coast, fresh fish was never seen in country places); the arable land grew the wheat which, when ground at the neighbouring soak mill, came back diminished perhaps a little improperly in weight, but not doctored with alum or stuff, and was in the kitchen converted into bread, and the garden supplied every kind of fruit and vegetable that was needed. Honey, for which we substitute sugar, was procured from the apiary, and the home dairy gave plenty of cheese and butter.




Nor was this all. Save in the two or three large (at least they were considered large then,) towns, almost every one, lady or gentleman, was in those days a domestic manager, and, indeed, generally a cook. Isaac Walton was clearly far prouder of cooking that memorable chub, with the white mark on his tail, than he was of catching it; and even the dandy cavalier, Cotton, went to his kitchen to dress with his own hands a greyling for his guest. In those days ladies cooked and candied, preserved and pickled. The barley of the adjacent field was converted into malt, and every March and October that malt was converted into 'ale—ale, too, that contained nothing but malt, hops, and water. In the southern part of the island grapes yielded wine, and farther north other fruits furnished a beverage almost equal to it. Every sauce, preserve, pickle, potted meat, and the like, had not only their materials generally raised at home, but they were compounded at home. Perhaps sometimes they wanted a gout which the experience of manufacturing on a large scale can alone teach to produce, but at any rate everything was wholesome and honestly made, and fit to eat and drink.

For many years, save in isolated places, all this has been changed. Now bread is almost universally bought from a baker, and the baker as universally purchases his flour from a wholesale miller; malt liquor is procured from the retailer of a brewer; no real i.e. grape wine is made at all at home, although a great portion of that consumed is really of home production; vinegar, sauces, confectionary, pickles, &c., are bought from shopkeepers, and lastly, many articles now of common usage, but which were not so three or four centuries ago, and which are obtained from foreign countries, are necessarily purchased from similar sources.

Theoretically there is no objection to all this. A baker operating on a pretty large scale economizes fuel and so forth, so as to be able to supply families with bread as cheaply as they could make it, and yet keep a profit to himself of five, or seven, or may be, sometimes ten per cent. The brewer may act in a similar manner, and so the pickle manufacturer, and the like, all being able to sell, particularly to townspeople, an article of production, that if made on a small scale at home, and particularly if, as would likely be the case, made after some empirical and

extravagant receipt, would actually cost more money. The purchase of tea, coffee, &c., on the small scale, is also cheaper than buying these articles in large quantities. Practically, at the present day, there is an objection to all this. Are all the bakers honest men, and is what they sell really pure bread? May the brewers be trusted to sell nothing but malt, hops, and water? Do many of the Italian warehousemen impose upon their customers in the articles that they supply them with? Do most of the grocers carefully avoid selling an adulterated article? or do they not themselves purposely adulterate it? Unfortunately, but unquestionably, in these, and in many similar cases, the bad answer to these questions is the true one. We laugh at the Yankees for their trade tricks, their wooden nutmegs, and their imitation carrot seeds, and in this country we scarcely as yet cheat without a profit and for the mere love of the thing, but particularly after the perusal of the work now under our notice, it is impossible to deny that there is a large section of our middle classes concerned in trade, and who are considered quite respectable, and yet who, in the practice of their various occupations, commit great impositions, and systematically utter falsehoods. In particular almost every article of food that can be adulterated is so, and that very often too, in many cases, with highly poisonous ingredients, the consequences being an immense amount of imposition, and, what is still worse, of disease.

It is now many years since Accum published his celebrated "Death in the Pot" treatise, and since then the subject has been attended to by Mitchell, Normandy, and others. But the writings of these gentlemen have made little public impression, one reason probably being that the existing state of our knowledge at the time did not in all cases enable them to make their statements sufficiently exact and precise. Some four years ago Dr. Hassall, who, besides the more ordinary studies of a physician, has paid particular attention to microscopical investigations, had his attention turned to ground coffee, as sold in the shops, and he read the result of his investigations upon this article made by means of the microscope to the London Botanical Society, and his paper excited considerable attention. This led him to consider the state of sugar, as sold in our shops, but while he was doing this he was applied to by Mr. Wakley, as proprietor of the "Lancet," to investigate the



actual state of articles of food in general, as usually found in the shops, and (at least eventually) if he found any particular sample adulterated, to publish the name of the vendor, with the particular nature and extent of the adulteration, Mr. Wakley taking all the responsibility of such publication. Accordingly Dr. Hassall has already investigated nearly fifty articles of food, or classes of articles of food, and has discovered an amount of adulteration which certainly no person was prepared for. Only one or two dealers, the purity of whose goods has been denied, have attempted to defend themselves, or to explain away their proceedings, and every one who has so attempted has completely failed. The secret of his success has been, that in addition to chemical analysis, he has used the microscope in his inquiries, and his merit not only consists in the able manner in which he has employed the instrument, but in his being the first to use it practically, and to such an extent, for the purpose. Before giving an abstract of some of the results that he obtained, we may cite as an example of the almost infallible accuracy to which he has attained the following fact.

He had remarked that he had not succeeded in procuring one single genuine sample of flour of mustard in London. Upon this Mr. Davies, of Newcastle, a flour of mustard manufacturer, and whose conduct, if a little suspicious at first, was highly honourable afterwards, wrote to him. We extract his first letter, Dr. Hassall's reply, and Mr. Davies's second and creditable letter.

“ To the Editor of the *Lancet*.

“ Sir,—I noticed in a late number of the *Lancet* a statement that genuine mustard was not to be obtained in London, and have found such to be the case. I have been a manufacturer of mustard for twenty years, and during that time have frequently attempted to introduce it into the London trade, but could never succeed. The London mustard is principally made from the white mustard seed, with the addition of the ingredients mentioned in your analysis. The description of mustard I manufacture is taken from the brown seed, (*Sinapis nigra*), of which I take the liberty of sending you a sample. You will find it quite free from the adulterations found in the London mustards. The reason why I could never get it into the London market is, the difference of colour, it being much darker than that made from the white seed, and the

brown seed being much dearer and less productive, I have to charge a higher price for it. I am, Sir, yours obediently,

“THOS. DAVIES.”

The following is Dr. Hassall's brief reply.

“Our correspondent is deceived, the article he has sent us is not a specimen of pure brown mustard, as it contains a small quantity of turmeric.”—ED. LANCET.

This is Mr. Davies's answer.

“To the Editor of the Lancet.

“Sir,—In my letter to you of the 31st ultimo respecting my mustard, I stated you would find it free from the adulterations found in the London markets, which I contend it is, except, as you observe, ‘a small portion of turmeric,’ viz., *two ounces to fifty-six pounds* of seed, not for the purpose of gain or adulteration, but simply to enliven the colour and make its appearance more acceptable. However, your remarks have determined me to relinquish that small portion of extraneous matter, and depend solely on its original colour and strength for its future success.

“I am, Sir, yours obediently,

“THOMAS DAVIES.

“Enclosed is a sample without colouring.

“Newcastle on Tyne.”

That is to say, that Dr. Hassall detected, by means of the microscope, one part of turmeric in five hundred and forty-seven of mustard. Even people not acquainted with science are now accustomed to hear of chemists being able to do something of this nature, although not to such compound articles as turmeric powder, but to many the manner in which this is done by means of the microscope will seem inexplicable. It is, however, very simple. Any one with ordinary powers of vision can distinguish when the two objects are near him, between a horse and a cow, but if he look into a piece of putrid cheese, &c., he cannot discriminate between two kinds of mites that may be there. If, however, he inspect the mites through a magnifying glass of sufficient power, he can tell the one from the other as easily as in the other case, he can pronounce which is the horse and which the cow. So with vegetable, (or in like manner with mineral) substances, any one having a knowledge of botany can distinguish between a mustard and a turmeric plant, but when the edible parts

of these two are finely powdered down, his unassisted eye refuses to do so. But if the powders are magnified some, say, two hundred times, the difference between the two powders again becomes sufficiently distinct. In the case before us, for example, powdered turmeric occurs in large cells, and powdered mustard in extremely small ones, and a person accustomed to the use of the microscope can at once pronounce which is which. In fact, as there is no simple element, the existence of which cannot be detected by means of chemistry, and its nature ascertained, so there is no compound article of food that cannot have *its* nature determined by means of the microscope. For the future, then, any adulteration of an article of food may be in one of these two manners easily detected, and for the latter of these two modes of detection we are practically, as before mentioned, much indebted to Dr. Hassall.

We now proceed to enumerate some of the results of his investigations, and in doing so our limits compel us to consider but a few of the articles of food examined by Dr. Hassall. We cannot pass over bread, pickles, preserves, cayenne pepper, curry powder, ginger, mustard, tea, coffee, and chicory.

If bread was once the "staff of life," it is now certainly very often the crutch of destruction. All the specimens examined by Dr. Hassall, which he had purchased from London shops, were adulterated, and a constant adulteration was the very dangerous one of alum. Out of forty-nine samples examined not one was found free from this impurity, and the purchase of "stuff," a compound of alum and common salt, appears to be constantly and extensively carried on by the London and, we fear, also by the provincial bakers. It is sold largely by the druggists, and by the corn chandlers, and is also known by the name of "hards."

"This consists of a mixture of alum and salt. It is kept in bags holding from a quarter to one hundred weight; it is sold by the druggist, who supplies either the baker or the corn-chandler,—the latter again in some cases furnishing the baker with it from time to time, as he may require. In country towns and villages the baker is put to considerable trouble to procure his supplies of "stuff," for, as he is unwilling that his friends and neighbours should know that he makes use of any such article in his bread, he generally contrives to procure it of a druggist living some miles away from his own town. On Saturday night a druggist in good


business will have several applications in the course of the evening for alum, hards, and stuff."—p. 160.

According to Markham the maximum quantity of alum detected in a loaf of bread was 116 grains, and the minimum $34\frac{1}{2}$. The average amount in ten loaves that were examined was more than 80 grains, or supposing a sack of flour to yield 92 loaves, 16 ounces to the sack. This average quantity is calculated to have a deleterious effect upon most people, and the maximum quantity very much so indeed. Alum is a powerful astringent, and its continued use doubtless tends to check very materially the due secretions of the alimentary canal and the digestive organs in general.

The main end attained by the baker by adding alum to the dough is, that by virtue of the great affinity of that salt for water, an unnecessary quantity of that fluid is retained, and hence the loaf weighs more than it really ought to do for the quantity of flour that it actually contains. Or in other words, the baker obtains from the same quantity of flour an increased but improper quantity of loaves. If the flour be of bad quality and discoloured, the alum too, from the property that it possesses of combining with organic colouring matter, whitens it. Upon the whole this adulteration of bread with alum may be pronounced to be a very dangerous one, and of almost constant practice.

The nature and the extent of the adulterations of pickles are such as to make one wonder that there have been such things as law and police in Great Britain.

"To persons," writes Dr. Hassall, "unacquainted with the subject, the title of this report, 'Pickles and their Adulterations,' may appear somewhat singular, and they may be disposed to ask, 'Are not the girkins, cabbages, beans, &c., which one see in the bottle what they appear to be? And are other vegetables than those commonly known to us mixed with the ordinary kinds?' To these questions we thus reply. 'Girkins,' on close examination, often turn out to be but shrivelled or sliced cucumbers; 'the young tender beans' to be old and tough; the 'cauliflowers' to have run to seed, and the 'red cabbage' to be nothing more than white cabbage, turned into red by colouring matter, as a dyer would change the colour of a dress; further, that among the vegetables not unfrequently employed for the purpose of pickle making, are some which do not enter into the calculation of the epicure, as vegetable marrows, which, when cut



into pieces, form a very respectable imitation of cucumbers, and sliced turnips, the identification of which would be apt to puzzle even a botanist, as well as certainly all those who are uninitiated in the secrets of a pickle manufactory.

“But the adulteration to which we more especially allude, and to the consideration of which our attention will be particularly directed in the following remarks, are those which refer to the quality and composition of the vinegar used for pickling, as well as the means employed for preserving and heightening the colour of green pickles.”—pp. 383-4.

One of the practices followed by the wholesale pickle manufacturers, although not very injurious, is a fraud. The greater part of the vegetables intended for pickling are bought for the sake of economy in the continental markets, and preserved by means of salt. Portions of these are taken out from week to week as they are wanted, for the purpose of being made into pickle, and sent into the market. One consequence of this is, that the colour of the green ones is more or less lost, and this gives an additional temptation to employ, as a colouring agent, a poisonous substance immediately to be noticed, acetate of copper. Of sixteen samples analyzed for cupreous salts, the presence of this poisonous metal was detected in every instance, and in only two samples was it found in small quantity. In one it was in considerable quantity,—in three, in very considerable,—in one, in highly deleterious, and in two in poisonous amount. This last expression means in immediately poisonous quantities. In this last-mentioned case the acute symptoms of copper poisoning, the violent vomiting, &c., and the disordered state of the nervous system that characterize acute copper poisoning will be induced if a sufficiently large quantity of the pickle be eaten at a meal; but in the other cases, in which a small quantity of the poison is introduced into the system, the symptoms of chronic copper poisoning will be brought on, as great disorder of the digestive organs, slow fever, and wasting of the body. And there can be little doubt that in this manner many cases of so-called semi-acute dyspepsia are created. Moreover, the vinegar employed in pickling is scarcely ever sufficiently strong, and the deficiency of acetic acid in it is made up by the addition of oil of vitriol. Of twenty samples examined this was found to be the case in nineteen instances. Although this is a

fraud, it is perhaps not a very dangerous one to the health of the consumer.

The preserves and jams of the shops are in as bad a state as the pickles. To say nothing of the substitution of turnips and apples for oranges in marmalade, of currant jelly and orris root for the more expensive raspberry jelly, which, if deceptions are not injurious to the health, almost every jar of preserves sold in the shops contains copper, sometimes apparently obtained from the copper vessels in which they are prepared, but also sometimes clearly purposely added directly. Thus, of nine samples of greengage jam that were examined, all were found impregnated with copper, and in five, the injurious substance was present to a very considerable extent; the same fruit, in three samples of crystallized fruit, was found to owe its intense green colour to the like adulterations; all the samples examined of greengage jam, nine in number contained copper, and five in considerable quantity; in fact, of thirty-five samples of this class of condiments that were examined, thirty-three contained this poisonous adulteration of copper, and nineteen of those in very large amount. Bottled fruits and vegetables are in nearly as bad a condition, copper being added to them in order to improve their appearance by increasing the intensity of the green colour. Thirty-three samples were examined, and twenty-seven were found more or less impregnated with this dangerous poison, and in all these cases it must have been introduced purposely, for it was found to be absent from the red fruits, to which of course the communication of a green colour is not desired by the vendor. Moreover, no copper utensil is used in their preparation, and hence none could accidentally get amongst them. Of the thirty-three samples examined seven contained the adulteration in small quantities only, eight in considerable, and six in very considerable amount, while four samples had the poison in very large quantity. The degree to which the adulteration is carried appears to vary a good deal in the different kinds of fruits. Gooseberries receive a considerable portion, rhubarb still more, greengages the largest quantity of any fruit thus preserved in this country, while olives were found to be the worst of all. This last fact is the more remarkable as a green colour is not necessary to this fruit. The impregnation of these bottled fruits with copper is even more dangerous than the same

adulteration of pickles, as so much larger quantities of them are consumed at a time. We should mention in passing, that, although the red preserved fruits, as red currants, are not doctored with verdigris, yet that, fruit which is damaged, or of inferior quality, is bought and artificially coloured with beet root.

The consumption of curry powder and cayenne pepper is so limited, and so much confined to classes of society, to the members of which, cheapness, particularly in articles used on so small a scale, is no great matter, that we might have expected they would escape adulteration. The very reverse, however, is the case,—curry powder is extensively adulterated both with innocent and poisonous admixtures. Out of twenty-six samples examined seven only were genuine, and sixteen adulterated. Nine specimens contained, and usually in great quantities, ground rice, and one potato starch, and eight had their weight increased by the addition of common starch. All this is simple cheating, what follows is dangerous poisoning into the bargain. Eight samples contained the dangerous poison—red lead. As the saturnine preparations are accumulative poisons, and produce various chronic diseases of the nervous system, and also of the organs of secretion, the amount of illness induced by the frequent use of adulterated curry powder is probably very considerable. Of course it is purposely added either to the curry powder, or to one of the ingredients of the curry powder, for it could not possibly get in accidentally. A very easy remedy is suggested by Dr. Hassall.

“The whole of the ingredients required for making curry powder may be obtained from most seedsmen.....With a common pestle and mortar the seeds may be reduced to powder, and thus the housekeeper may herself prepare genuine curry powder of the best quality, at a cost of about 2d. per ounce. Since curry powder is retailed at 6d., 8d., and even 1s. an ounce, it evidently bears an enormous profit.”—p. 477.

Of twenty-eight samples of cayenne pepper that were subjected to analysis, only four were found genuine. Of the remaining twenty-four, too, the majority were adulterated with poisonous matter. Thus, thirteen samples contained red lead, and one vermillion or sulphuret of mercury. The other adulterations were ground rice, mustard, seed husks, brick-dust, &c.

Even powdered ginger is most extensively mixed with inferior seasoning substances, or with altogether useless adulterations. Of twenty-one samples submitted to examination, Dr. Hassall found fifteen adulterated, and in the majority of these the amount of the adulteration actually exceeded in quantity that of the genuine ginger. Sago meal, potato flour, ground rice, are the principal articles used, while cayenne pepper, turmeric, and ground mustard husks are added, with a view of concealing the adulteration, and giving a fictitious pungency. As stated above, flour of mustard is most extensively adulterated. Dr. Hassall examined no less than forty-two samples and found every one impure. An immense quantity of wheaten flour (which is much cheaper than mustard flour) is added, and the mixture is then coloured to the requisite hue with turmeric. In some manner which, however, appears to be a secret among the adulterators, the colouring matter of the turmeric is uniformly different through the whole mixture. It is probably effected by applying heat and moisture simultaneously to the compound.

We will quote Dr. Hassall's own abstract of the result of his investigation into tea.

“The chief points ascertained with regard to Black Teas were—

“1st. The principal Black Teas, namely, the Congous and Sou-chongs, arrive in this country for the most part in a genuine state.

“2nd. That certain descriptions of black tea, as Scented Orange Pekoe and Caper, are invariably adulterated, the adulteration consisting in the glazing the leaves with plumbago, or black lead, the Caper likewise being subject to admixture with other substances, as Paddy husk and Lie tea, and leaves other than those of tea.

“3rd. That several varieties of a spurious caper or black Gunpowder are prepared, which consist of tea dust, and sometimes the dust of other leaves and sand, made up into little masses with gum, and faced or glazed with plumbago, Prussian blue and turmeric powder; in some cases these imitations are sold separately, but most frequently they are used to mix with and adulterate the better qualities of Caper, viz., those which are made of tea, faced with plumbago only.”

“With respect to Green Teas the principal conclusions were:—

“1st. That these teas, with the exception of a few of British growth and manufacture from Assam, are invariably adulterated, that is to say, are glazed with colouring matter of different kinds.

“2nd. That the colouring matters used are in general Prussian blue, turmeric powder, and China clay, other ingredients being sometimes, but not frequently, employed.

“3rd. That of these colouring matters Prussian blue, or ferro cyanide of iron, possesses properties calculated to affect health injuriously.

“4th. That in this country there really is no such thing as a green tea, that is, a tea which possesses a natural green hue.


“5th. That green teas, and more especially the Gunpowders, in addition to being faced and glazed, are more subject to adulteration in other ways than black teas, as by admixture with leaves not those of tea, with Paddy husk, and particularly with Lie tea.

“6th. That Lie tea is prepared so as to resemble green tea, and is extensively used by the Chinese themselves to adulterate gunpowder tea; it is also sent over to this country in vast quantities, and is employed for the same purpose by our own tea dealers and grocers.”—Introduction pp. xv. xvi.

Such are some of the adulterations practised by the Chinese. Unfortunately, after its arrival in this country, tea is subjected to many more frauds. In the first place, exhausted tea leaves are extensively bought up, dried, and “faced,” or coated with various substances, in order to communicate the appearance of freshness, and sold as fresh tea. Exhausted tea leaves, it seems, can be bought at hotels, and such like places, at about three pence per pound, or less. These are mixed up with a solution of gum, redried, and then faced, as it is called, with rose pink, (i.e., logwood and carbonate of lime,) and blacklead. This makes, in appearance, a genuine tea, but which, of course, contains none of the soluble matter of the tea, and which soluble ingredients constitute its sole value as the basis of a beverage. Manufacturing green tea from exhausted leaves is also done, but the process is more difficult. Sulphate of iron is sometimes added to these exhausted tea leaves, to form some ink with the tannin, and thus strike a dark colour to give the appearance of strength. All these adulterations are very easy of detection. Indeed, the broken state of many of the leaves will in many instances indicate what has taken place. Sometimes, however, the leaves of indigenous trees, as those of the sycamore, horse chestnut, &c., are prepared and sold as tea. The microscope enables any such fraud as this to be discovered without any difficulty. In most of the cases in which this kind of imposition is attempted, some portion of the tea is genuine. For various other very instructing and important facts connected with the adulteration of tea, we must refer to the work of Dr. Hassall, and merely

observe here that some of the adulterations practised upon tea in this country are far more dangerous than any of the kind that takes place in China, before the tea is sent off to this country.

Coffee was, and perhaps notwithstanding the precautions taken recently to prevent the admixture of chicory with it, still is as much improperly interfered with as tea. Independently of the notorious admixture of ground coffee with chicory, it is very commonly adulterated with roasted corn, beans, potato flour, mangold wurzel, acorns, and other fraudulent admixtures. But, as is now universally known, until recently the great adulteration of coffee was with chicory, which sometimes formed a half, and sometimes nearly all of what was sold as ground coffee. The selling the mixture under the name of coffee is now punishable with a heavy fine, and as the detection of chicory in a sample is extremely easy, this fraudulent adulteration and fraud upon the public would probably have been put an end to had not the mixture been legalized by Mr. Gladstone, who was chancellor of the exchequer at the time, provided the mixture were labelled "mixture of chicory and coffee." It is impossible to conceive any reason for this, or any plan more likely to encourage the fraudulent trader. In the first place the "mixture" might contain ninety-nine per cent of chicory and only one of coffee, or to use Dr. Hassall's words, "a pinch of coffee to a pound of chicory;" in the second place the label would not be of much use to the very great numbers who cannot read, and who constitute the very class that require protecting from such frauds the most; and lastly, in a truly Anglican spirit, the label was to be in English even in Irish and Welsh districts, where the great majority of the inhabitants did not understand one word of that language. Dr. Hassall accordingly purchased after this treasury minute came into force thirty-four samples of coffee, buy them all in one day, and from every shop on each side of the street that he noticed to sell the article. He asked in every case for coffee, and the following was the result. Three, and three only, of the thirty-four parcels turned out to be genuine, and thirty-one contained chicory. In six of the samples the chicory constituted a third of the whole powder, in twenty-two about half, while three specimens were nearly entirely chicory. Notwithstanding the treasury order, ten of the mixtures were not labelled as



such, and in the twenty-one other instances, although the label was put on, yet in such case coffee was particularly asked for.

The names of the tradespeople who sold Dr. Hassall the adulterated coffee were all published, with their addresses, in the *Lancet*. A little time afterwards he again purchased coffee from the same shops. He had the satisfaction of finding that his exposure had done some little good. In place of three genuine samples out of thirty-four, he obtained nine, and twenty-five, instead of thirty-one, contained the adulteration. In eight of these latter chicory constituted a third, fourteen a half, and three were nearly all chicory together. Of the twenty-five samples, although coffee was asked for quite distinctly, twenty-three were labelled as "Mixture of coffee and chicory," and two not. As the treasury minute had so little effect, the label was ordered to be changed from "Mixture of coffee and chicory" to "This is sold as a mixture of coffee and chicory." The new set of words, according to Mr. Wilson, their author, "would effectually prevent anything like fraud in future." It has probably had no effect whatever. We entirely agree with Dr. Hassall in his remarks upon the impropriety of the treasury countenancing, by its formal permission, what is sure in practice to be a fraud.

"The fundamental objection to the recent Treasury order is, that it is opposed to every principle of fair dealing and morality, since it affords the highest possible sanction to fraud and adulteration. Now the alteration in the form of the words of the package will not in any way diminish the force of the moral objection. The mixture, even with the new label affixed, will still be extensively palmed off for coffee. It will still be necessary, in order to derive the slight protection that the label might afford, that the purchaser, whoever he may be, the Irishman or Welshman, acquainted only with his native tongue, or the untaught child, should be able to decipher the words upon the wrapper. The mixture will still be sold, made up of coffee and chicory in all proportions, from ounces of the one to pounds of the other, if the article do not even in some cases consist entirely of chicory.

"It might surely have been fairly expected that after the disclosures which have been made by this commission now for upwards of two years, showing that the most extensive and disgraceful adulterations are practised upon almost every article of consumption, that the government, in place of affording encouragement to adulteration, would assuredly have considered how it could but put a

stop to practices so detrimental to the commercial character of the nation, and so fraught with danger to the public health."—p. 532.

Nothing perhaps better illustrates the contagious nature of trickery than the fact that chicory itself, employed to adulterate coffee, is itself now grossly adulterated. It is mixed with ground roasted corn, ground acorns, mangold wurzel, roasted carrot, sawdust, and, for the purpose of producing a heightened colour, venetian red, black jack, (i. e. burnt sugar,) burnt biscuits, &c.

There is a vague impression upon the public mind that a little admixture of chicory improves the beverage we call coffee. If this be the case, at any rate the proper plan is for each consumer to buy the two articles under their proper names, and mix them for himself. But we now know that genuine coffee and tea contain a nitrogenous principle, to which the name of *caffeine* and *theine* are given. It is not, perhaps, yet a settled point as to whether they yield nitrogen to the system for the purpose of keeping up nitrogenous structures, or whether, as conjectured by Liebig, they assist in forming bile. At any rate it may, we think, be safely affirmed, that the dietetical value, and therefore the money value of tea and coffee mainly depend upon the presence of this nitrogenous compound, and therefore that any admixture of a substance which, like chicory, contains none such, is a positive fraud upon the consumer and purchaser. Upon this point Dr. Hassall thus expresses himself.

“In favour of the adulteration it is alleged,

“First, that the admixture of chicory with coffee improves coffee, and that such addition is approved of by the public.

“In order to ascertain whether the addition of chicory to coffee be really an improvement, we prepared three infusions, one of coffee, another of chicory, and the third of both these, mixed in the proportions of three-fourths coffee and one-fourth chicory.

“The infusion of *coffee* was perfectly transparent, and of a dark and rich brown colour; it emitted an odour in a high degree penetrating and refreshing, and the taste was agreeable and rather bitter.

“Having been taken for a few minutes it produced a feeling of general warmth, and a state of bodily and mental activity and invigoration.

“The infusion of *chicory* was opaque, staining the sides of the vessel containing it; it possessed a heavy, though some people might be of opinion not a disagreeable smell, wholly unlike, how-



ever, the volatile and diffusive odour of coffee; in taste it was more bitter than the coffee, with a certain degree of sweetness.

“ Having been swallowed for a few minutes it occasioned a feeling of weight at the stomach, and a general heaviness and indisposition to bodily and mental exertion.

“ The combined infusion of chicory and coffee partook to a great extent of the characters of the infusion of genuine coffee, as might be anticipated from the large quantity of coffee that it contained.

“ Altogether, we were unable to bring ourselves to believe that the addition of chicory to coffee, in the proportion of twenty-five per cent of the former, was any improvement; on the contrary, we were satisfied that the quality of the beverage was greatly impaired by the addition.

“ Persons who are foolish enough to regard a slight sensation of weight and fulness in the region of the stomach, symptoms really of incipient indigestion, as evidences of the beverage being possessed of increased ‘strength’ and ‘body,’ might possibly be brought to consider the addition as an improvement.”—p. 120.

With this extract we unwillingly for the meantime, at least, close the volume. At another time, perhaps, we may make use of its revelations respecting tobacco and its preparations, malt liquors, and gin. The amount of adulteration in almost every article of food and drink, that the pages of Dr. Hassall reveal, is very appalling, and indicate that a great deal of our conventional and almost stereotyped boasting of our commercial integrity is absolutely without foundation. Very likely our neighbours are, in this respect, not a bit better than ourselves, but the disclosures of Dr. Hassall seem to us to prove that we have no better plan of obtaining unadulterated food than by having rigid laws enacted against offenders, and by strictly enforcing them. At any rate science has done her part, and pointed out both the evil and its various forms.

ART. III.—*Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to El Medinah and Meccah.* By RICHARD F. BURTON. 8vo. Vols. I. II. London: Longmans, 1855.

MR. BURTON has had the good fortune to light upon what we had thought was, in these of universal travel, an absolute impossibility for a tourist, a perfectly novel theme. The motto of his title-page, taken from Gibbon;—"our notions of Mecca must be drawn from the Arabians, as no unbeliever is permitted to enter the sacred city:"—retains its full significance to the present hour. El Medinah and Meccah are still regarded as cities, which the tread of an infidel foot would desecrate; and the rigour with which the exclusion of foreigners has been enforced, has hitherto sufficed to preserve one spot at least sacred from the explorations of the indefatigable emissaries of the Geographical Society, or the still more enterprising compilers of Handbooks of Oriental Travel.

In truth, an unobstructed visit to either of these cities, or indeed to any part of the wild region in which they are situated, can only be performed in complete masquerade. It is not alone that the visitor must be a Moslem. So jealous is the surveillance, that even proselytes to Mahomedanism are practically excluded, being watched with so much suspicion that it is impossible for them to observe anything with satisfaction. A western visitor of the Moslem Holy Land, if he would hope to see, and to describe what he has seen, must not merely visit in the garb of a native Mahomedan, but must be such a proficient in the language and usages of the East, as to defy the scrutiny of his prying and suspicious fellow-pilgrims.

Under these circumstances it will easily be believed that the number of Mr. Burton's European predecessors in the Haj (or pilgrimage) has been very small. In 1503, Ludovico Bartema, "a gentleman of the citie of Rome," succeeded, through "the familiaritie and friendshippe of a certayne Captayne Mameluke," in obtaining the entree of Medinah and Meccah, as a member of the Damascus caravan of pilgrims, and in the garb of a "Mamaluchi

renegado." Towards the close of the next century, Joseph Pitts, of Exon, who was captured by an Algerine pirate, sold into slavery when but fifteen or sixteen years old, and compelled by the bastinado to profess himself a proselyte to Mahomedanism, was taken by his "patroon" on a pilgrimage to Meccah and Medinah, in 1680, and Giovanni Finati, an unprincipled Italian adventurer and renegade, repeated the experiment in 1814—the year before the ill-starred expedition in which the life of Burckhardt was sacrificed. The only European whom Mr. Burton himself has met with that had visited Meccah without apostatizing, is M. Bertolucci, the Swedish consul at Cairo, who induced the Bedouin Camel-men who were accompanying him to Taif, to introduce him in disguise. The late Dr. Wallin, professor of Arabic at the University of Helsingfors, performed the pilgrimage in 1845, in somewhat similar circumstances. But of these the former confesses, that his terror of being discovered effectually prevented him from making any observations, and the latter was hindered by the perils of his position, and the filthiness of his Persian fellow-travellers, from taking any notes of the little that he succeeded in observing.


Independently, therefore, of the interest which must attach to any account of a region so completely unknown in the West, the very narrative of an expedition so novel, and involving so much peril as well as of novelty, would be for its own sake sufficiently curious and attractive. The boldness and enterprise which Mr. Burton's former work on Scinde have shown to be his great characteristic, as well as his perfect familiarity with all the various forms of Eastern life, mark him out as peculiarly fitted at once to carry out the undertaking with success, to turn all its opportunities to the best and most satisfactory purpose, and to record its adventures with a lively and a graphic pen.

Accordingly, Mr. Burton has had the boldness to undertake the exploration of the sacred cities, not in the character of a renegado Christian, nor under a partial and temporary disguise, favoured and assisted by the corrupt connivance of some unscrupulous official, but as a regular member of the ordinary pilgrim caravan ;—following it in all the stages of its progress, seeking no concealment, affecting no secrecy, but openly and unvaryingly maintaining, in language, in observances, in food, in mode of

life, and in a word, in every minute detail of conduct and deportment, the character of a native oriental, performing the work of piety which constitutes the great event in the religious life of every Moslem !

We shall see hereafter with what fidelity and minuteness he carried out this bold and daring project; with what painful scrupulousness he accommodated to all the distasteful details of "bed and board" of the poorer class of Eastern travellers; with what solemn earnestness he fulfilled every religious observance; how he went through the prescribed round of ablutions, prostrations, bead-tellings, and prayerful evolutions; how in fine he, to all intents and purposes, became, for the time, a thorough-going Turk. On the morality of all this we shall not stop to speculate. We have no doubt that what he did, he did solely in the interest of science, and without any idea whatever of dishonouring the Christian profession; nor shall we range ourselves with the "jocose editors" in India and elsewhere, who, on these grounds, have taxed Mr. Burton with "Turning Turk." But when we shall have told his story in his own words, hereafter, we shall leave him to settle the lawfulness of the proceeding with those among his own fellow religionists, who are most loud and unreserved in the abhorrence of Jesuitism, and of the arts which, in the notion frequently entertained of the order, Jesuitism is said to employ for the attainments of its ends. Never has the world seen a more thorough-going Jesuit, such as Jesuits are popularly described, than our Haji, the Dervish Abdullah—the name and profession assumed by Dr. Burton, as being one of the most familiar and convenient incognitos under which to travel in the East.

Indeed, if we could only put aside the question of the morality of the proceeding, it would be amusing to follow the pilgrim through all the phases of his assumed character as one of the holy men of Islam—to watch him as he carefully interlards his conversation with pious ejaculations to Allah, to his Prophet, and to the manifold Moslem saints whose memory is sweet at Medinah and Meccah; to see him piously pass from the *Dua*, or double prostration, to the *Sudjah*, or single one; or meekly assume the orthodox attitude of prayer, "placing his hands below the waist, and slightly inclined to the left, the right palm covering the left;" to listen to his murmured



litanies, responses, "testifications," "Fât-hâhs," verses, and even whole chapters from the Koran; to see him anxiously placing himself, so that his face should front Meccah, and his right shoulder should be opposite the right pillar of the Prophet's Pulpit! Nay, not content with the ordinary practices of personal devotion, we find him not merely discharging vicarious offices of piety in the name of acquaintances or friends, whom he had met upon his way, and who had charged him with such pious commissions on their behalf, (II. p. 79.) but even remonstrating with his companions for their want of devotion, and exhorting them to due fervour in the discharge of the observances of the pilgrimage. All this would in itself be sufficiently amusing; but we must say with pain that there are too many serious and awful considerations, however, involved in these and many similar incidents of the book, to be made a subject of idle merriment.

We can enjoy with a more comfortable feeling the ready *bonhomie* with which Mr. Burton accommodated himself to the *social* peculiarities involved in the requirements of his assumed character. No Madani of the Bait-el-Shaab, just returned after a commercial tour, could fall more naturally into the ranks of the pilgrim caravan, or follow with more easy grace all the mazes of the complicated ceremonial of Eastern life. His very stomach appears to have possessed an acclimatizing capacity,—to have received the rudest desert fare—the *kahk*, the date-paste, the "mare's skin," and the clarified butter, with as much composure as it had been wont to exhibit under the influence of the roast beef of Old England; and to have revelled in the vile-tasted *akit*, or the "leather-flavoured water" of the Red-Sea Pilgrim-ship, with as much seeming satisfaction as in the pale ale, or iced champagne of the Travellers or United Service club. It is only one who has really lived in the East, and who, even there, has lived in native, as contradistinguished from colonial society, that can understand how much is implied in this diversity of usages. "Look, for instance," writes Mr. Burton, "at an Indian Moslem drinking a glass of water. With us the operation is simple enough, but his performance includes no less than five novelties. In the first place, he clutches his tumbler as though it were the throat of a foe; secondly he ejaculates, 'In the name of Allah the Compassionate, the Mer-

ciful!" before wetting his lips; thirdly, he imbibes the contents, swallowing them, not drinking, and ending with a satisfied grunt; fourthly, before setting down the cup he sighs forth, 'Praise be to Allah!' of which you will understand the full meaning in the Desert; and fifthly, he replies, 'May Allah make it pleasant to thee!' in answer to his friend's polite, 'Pleasantly and health!' Also, he is careful to avoid the irreligious action of drinking the pure element in a standing position, mindful, however, of the three recognized exceptions, the fluid of the Holy Well, Zemzem, water distributed in charity, and that which remains after Wuza, the lesser ablution. Moreover, in Europe, one forgets the use of the right hand, the manipulation of the rosary, the abuse of the chair; your genuine Orientalist looks almost as uncomfortable in one as a sailor upon the back of a high trotting horse—the rolling gait with the toes, straight to the front, the grave look and habit of pious ejaculations." These, and a thousand similar discrepancies from what our European notions demand in posture, look, intonation, pervade the whole manner and deportment of an Eastern—discrepancies impalpable, perhaps, to an unpractised eye, but which a native will detect with rapid and unerring accuracy.

Even with qualifications such as these for eastern society, Mr. Burton found it necessary to adopt every precaution against the danger of detection. Fortunately for him, the strongly oriental character of his features and of the expression of his countenance, went far to disarm suspicion. It would be hard, we must say, for the most practised eye to discover a flaw in the "making up" of the face or figure which are depicted in his "portrait in the character of a Haji," as it appears in the frontispiece of the second volume of the *Pilgrimage*.

The original design of Mr. Burton's expedition was much more comprehensive than that of which we have an account in the volumes before us. He offered himself to the Geographical Society in 1852, to undertake an exploring expedition for the purpose of "removing that opprobrium to modern adventure—the huge white blot which in our maps still notes the eastern and central regions of Arabia." Failing, however, to obtain from the Court of Directors of the East India Company, (in whose service he holds the rank of lieutenant,) a prolongation of his furlough sufficient

for an undertaking at once so protracted and so perilous, he was obliged to content himself with what he calls the *experimentum crucis* of a visit to El Hejaz, in order "to prove by trial that what might be perilous to other travellers was safe to him." For this purpose he was liberally supplied with the means of travel by the Geographical Society; and, impelled by a general love of adventure, as well as by a special longing to set foot on that mysterious spot, the Moslem's Holy Land, the jealously guarded and exclusive "Haram," he resumed the old character of a Persian wanderer, in which he is already familiar to the British public.

His first intention was "to cross the unknown Arabian peninsula in a direct line, from either El Medinah to Mussul, or diagonally from Meccah to Makallah, on the Indian Ocean." He was obliged, however, to content himself with a less vast but more practical programme. Of the great eastern wilderness, poetically described on our maps as *Ruba el Kali*, (the empty abode,) he learned only "that its horrid depths swarm with a large and half-starving population; that it abounds in wadys, valleys, gullies, and ravines, partially fertilized by intermittent torrents, and therefore that it is open only to the adventurous traveller."*

It is very difficult to define the exact limits of the district known as El Hejaz. It cannot be said to possess any natural boundaries, and, in that lawless region, the political boundaries are liable to endless changes. Mr. Burton, however, for convenience sake, has confined the designation to what is properly the Moslem Holy Land; taking Yambu and Jeddah as, respectively, the northern and southern points, and a line drawn through Medinah, Suwayrkirah, and the mountain of Taif as the eastern limit;—thus making El Hejaz an irregular parallelogram, two hundred and fifty miles in length, with a maximum breadth of one hundred and fifty. The source of religious

* Mr. Burton calls loudly for a revision of our oriental maps, and especially of their nomenclature, which he describes as often very inaccurate. He mentions a case in which *M'adri*, ("I don't know," evidently the answer given to some inquiring traveller,) is gravely put down as the name of a place! This is a parallel in real life for the "*Monsieur Nong tong paw*," of the comic song.

reverence with which every Moslem regards this spot lies, of course, in the memorials of the Prophet which it contains, and especially in the two sacred cities, Medinah and Meccah. Mr. Burton's visit to the latter forms the subject of a volume as yet unpublished, although promised during the course of this autumn. The volumes now before us are devoted to Medinah, and to the adventures of the pilgrimage thitherward. It is hardly necessary to explain that *El Medinah* merely means "the city," and is but a brief and familiar form for *Medinah El Nabi*, "the Prophet's City," by which designation it has been known in Moslem history from the very date of the Hegirah itself.

Mr. Burton's narrative begins with his departure from Southampton, on the evening of April 3, 1853. By the advice of a far-seeing brother officer, he assumed, like Burckhardt,* his new character with all its external appliances, from the very threshold of his pilgrimage, and embarked in the Peninsular and Oriental Co.'s steamer, "Bengal," under the designation of a Persian prince, in an eastern dress of most unexceptionable fashion, and with an exceedingly oriental looking "travelling equipage."

Arrived at Alexandria, after passing successfully through the first scrutiny of the crowd of loungers at landing, he was hospitably received by a kind friend, who, the better to blind the inquisitive eyes of servants and visitors, lodged him in an out-house, "where he could revel in the utmost freedom of life and manners," and forthwith commenced his training under the direction of a *Shaykh*, to revive his recollections of religious ablution, to get himself somewhat up again in the Koran, and to renew his acquaintance with the act of prostration. As a wider and more general school of oriental manners, he availed himself of the bazaars, cafes, mosques, baths, and other places of public resort.

* Indeed Burckhardt passed through precisely the same ordeal which Mr. Burton underwent;—having prepared himself in England to personify an Oriental, and making the whole pilgrimage in that capacity. His thorough knowledge of Arabic and perfect familiarity with Oriental life, enabled him to do so with success.



“After a month's hard work at Alexandria, I prepared to assume the character of a wandering Dervish, after reforming my title from ‘Mirza’ to ‘Shaykh’ Abdullah. A reverend man, whose name I do not care to quote, some time ago initiated me into his order, the Kadiriya, under the high-sounding name of Bismillah-Shah : and, after a due period of probation, he graciously elevated me to the proud position of a Murshid in the mystic craft. I was therefore sufficiently well acquainted with the tenets and practices of these Oriental Freemasons. No character in the Moslem world is so proper for disguise as that of the Dervish. It is assumed by all ranks, ages, and creeds ; by the nobleman who has been disgraced at court, and by the peasant who is too idle to till the ground ; by Dives, who is weary of life, and by Lazarus, who begs bread from door to door. Further, the Dervish is allowed to ignore ceremony and politeness, as one who ceases to appear upon the stage of life ; he may pray or not, marry or remain single as he pleases, be respectable in cloth of frieze as in cloth of gold, and no one asks him—the chartered vagabond—Why he comes here ? or Wherefore he goes there ? He may wend his way on foot alone, or ride his Arab steed followed by a dozen servants ; he is equally feared without weapons, as swaggering through the streets armed to the teeth. The more haughty and offensive he is to the people, the more they respect him ; a decided advantage to the traveller of choleric temperament. In the hour of imminent danger he has only to become a maniac, and he is safe ; a madman in the East, like a notably eccentric character in the West, is allowed to say or do whatever the spirit directs. Add to this character a little knowledge of medicine, a “moderate skill in magic and a reputation for caring for nothing but study and books, together with capital sufficient to save you from the chance of starving, and you appear in the East to peculiar advantage. The only danger of the ‘Path’ is, that the Dervish's ragged coat not unfrequently covers the cut-throat, and if seized in the society of such a ‘brother,’ you may reluctantly become his companion, under the stick or on the stake. For be it known, Dervishes are of two orders, the Sharai, or those who conform to religion, and the Be-Sharai, or Luti, whose practices are hinted at by their own tradition that ‘he we daurna name’ once joined them for a week, but at the end of that time left them in dismay, and returned to whence he came.”—Vol. i. pp. 20-22.

His next step was to provide a passport in his new capacity, having neglected to take this precaution before leaving England. This, after disbursing a dollar, he obtained from the English consul at Alexandria, (not without difficulty, and, after much unclean dressing and an unlimited expenditure of broken English,) in the capacity of “an

Indo-British subject named Abdullah, by profession a doctor."

It was not until now, however, that the real difficulty of the case began, as the following humorous scene, which we cannot bring ourselves to curtail, will sufficiently explain:—

"My new passport would not carry me without the Zabit or Police Magistrate's counter-signature, said the consul. Next day I went to the Zabi, who referred me to the Muhañz (Governor) of Alexandria, at whose gate I had the honour of squatting at least three hours, till a more compassionate clerk vouchsafed the information that the proper place to apply to was the Diwan Kharijiyeh (the Foreign Office). Thus a second day was utterly lost. On the morning of the third I started, as directed, for the palace, which crowns the Headland of Figs. It is a huge and countless shell of building in parallelogrammic form containing all kinds of public offices in glorious confusion, looking with their glaring white washed faces upon a central court, where a few leafless wind-rung trees seem struggling for the breath of life in an eternal atmosphere of clay, dust, and sun-blaze.


"The first person I addressed was a Kawwas or police officer, who, coiled comfortably up in a bit of shade fitting his person like a robe, was in full enjoyment of the Asiatic 'Kaif.' Having presented the consular certificate and briefly stated the nature of my business, I ventured to inquire what was the right course to pursue for a visá.

"They have little respect for Dervishes, it appears, at Alexandria!

"M'adri—'Don't know,' growled the man of authority without moving anything but the quantity of tongue necessary for articulation.

"Now there are three ways of treating Asiatic officials,—by bribe, by bullying or by bothering them with a dogged perseverance into attending to you and your concerns. The latter is the peculiar province of the poor; moreover, this time I resolved, for other reasons, to be patient. I repeated my question in almost the same words. Ruh! 'Be off,' was what I obtained for all reply. But this time the question went so far as to open his eyes. Still I stood twirling the paper in my hands, and looking very humble and very persevering, till a loud Ruh ya Kalb! 'Go O dog!' converted into a responsive curse the little speech I was preparing about the brotherhood of El-Islam and the mutual duties obligatory on true believers. I then turned away slowly and fiercely, for the next thing might have been a cut with the Kurbaj, and, by the hammer of Thor! British flesh and blood could never have stood that.

"After which satisfactory scene,—for satisfactory it was in one



sense, proving the complete fitness of the Dervish's dress,—I tried a dozen other promiscuous sources of information,—policemen, grooms, scribes, donkey boys, and idlers in general. At length, wearied of patience, I offered a soldier some pinches of tobacco, and promised him an oriental sixpence if he would manage the business for me. The man was interested by the tobacco and the pence ; he took my hand, and inquiring the while he went along, led me from place to place, till, mounting a grand staircase, I stood in the presence of Abbas Effendi, the governor's Naib, or deputy.

“It was a little, whey-faced, black-bearded Turk, coiled up in the usual conglomerate posture upon a calico-covered divan, at the end of a long bare large-windowed room. Without deigning even to nod the head, which hung over his shoulder with transcendent listlessness and affectation of pride in answer to my salams and benedictions, he eyed me with wicked eyes, and faintly ejaculated ‘Min ent?’ Then hearing that I was a Dervish and doctor—he must be an Osmanli Voltairian, that little Turk—the official snorted a contemptuous snort. He condescendingly added, however, that the proper source to seek was ‘Taht,’ which meaning simply ‘below,’ conveyed rather imperfect information in a topographical point of view to a stranger.

“At length, however, my soldier guide found out that a room in the custom-house bore the honourable appellation of ‘Foreign Office.’ Accordingly I went there, and, after sitting at least a couple of hours at the bolted door in the noon-day sun, was told, with a fury which made me think I had sinned, that the officer in whose charge the department was, had been presented with an olive branch in the morning, and consequently that business was not to be done that day. The angry-faced official communicated the intelligence to a large group of Anadolian, Caramanian, Boshniac, and Roumelian Turks,—sturdy, undersized, broad-shouldered, bare-legged, splay-footed, horny-fisted, dark-browed, honest-looking mountaineers, who were lounging about with long pistols and yataghans stuck in their broad sashes, head-gear composed of immense tarbooshes with proportionate turbans coiled round them, and two or three suits of substantial clothes, even at this season of the year, upon their shoulders.

“Like myself they had waited some hours, but they were not patient under disappointment : they bluntly told the angry official that he and his master were a pair of idlers, and the curses that rumbled and gurgled in their hairy throats as they strode towards the door, sounded like the growling of wild beasts.

“Thus was another day truly orientally lost. On the morrow, however, I obtained permission, in the character of Dr. Abdullah, to visit any part of Egypt I pleased, and to retain possession of my dagger and pistols.”—Vol. i. pp. 28-33.

The reason of all this self-imposed trouble and humiliation will, of course, be apparent. It was necessary, in order to preserve his incognito, and to guard against the manifold hazards of detection. In those primitive lands, where gossip is a part of the business of life, personal intelligence travels rapidly, and our pilgrim, had he tried to provide himself, as he might easily have done, with the necessary papers through any of the ordinary corrupt channels, would be exposed at any moment of his adventurous journey, to find that "full particulars" had been telegraphed before him on his way by the very official who was lax enough to take his money for a fraudulent transport, but too religious to permit the holy place to be profaned by the glance of an unbelieving eye.

A word as to his personal preparations for the journey:—

"Then I had to provide myself with certain necessaries for the way. These were not numerous. The silver-mounted dressing-case is here supplied by a rag containing a miswak, a bit of soap and a comb (wooden), for bone and tortoiseshell are not, religiously speaking, correct. Equally simple was my wardrobe; a change or two of clothing. The only article of canteen description was a zemzemiyah, a goat-skin water-bag, which communicates to its contents, especially when new, a ferruginous aspect and a wholesome, though hardly an attractive flavour of tauno-gelatine. This was a necessary; to drink out of a tumbler, possibly fresh from pig-eating lips, would have entailed a certain loss of reputation. For bedding and furniture I had a coarse Persian rug—which, besides being couch, acts as chair, table, and oratory—a cotton-stuffed chintz-covered pillow, a blanket in case of cold, and a sheet, which does duty for tent and musquito curtains in nights of heat. As shade is a convenience not always procurable, another necessary was a huge cotton umbrella of Eastern make, brightly yellow, suggesting the idea of an overgrown marigold. I had also a substantial housewife, the gift of a kind friend; it was a roll of canvas, carefully soiled, and garnished with needles and thread, cobbler's wax, buttons, and other such articles. These things were most useful in lands where tailors abound not; besides which, the sight of a man darning his coat or patching his slippers teems with pleasing ideas of humility. A dagger, a brass inkstand and pen-holder stuck in the belt, and a mighty rosary, which on occasion might have been converted into a weapon of offence, completed my equipment. I must not omit to mention the proper method of carrying money, which in these lands should never be entrusted to box or bag. A common cotton purse secured in a breast pocket,

(for Egypt now abounds in that civilized animal the pickpocket.) contained silver pieces and small change. My gold, of which I carried twenty-five sovereigns, and papers, were committed to a substantial leathern belt of Maghrabi manufacture, made to be strapped round the waist under the dress. This is the Asiatic method of concealing valuables, and a more civilised one than ours in the last century, when Roderic Random and his companion, 'sewed their money between the lining and the waistband of their breeches, except some loose silver for immediate expense on the road.' The great inconvenience of the belt is its weight, especially where dollars must be carried, as in Arabia, causing chafes and inconvenience at night. Moreover, it can scarcely be called safe. In dangerous countries wary travellers will adopt surer precautions.

"A pair of common native khurjin or saddle-bags contained my wardrobe, the 'bed,' readily rolled up into a bundle, and for a medicine chest I bought a pea-green box with red and yellow flowers, capable of standing falls from a camel twice a day."—Vol. i. pp. 34-39.

In this guise Haji Abdullah set sail as a third class passenger in the Nile boat for Cairo. His adventures upon the river are very graphically and well described, but we must not suffer ourselves to be seduced into loitering too long over the preliminaries of the real subject of the book, however interesting and amusing in themselves. At Cairo he met as a fellow-lodger, a shrewd Alexandrian wandering merchant, Huji Wali, who had also been his fellow-passenger on the Nile. From this experienced traveller he received some very important suggestions, which led to his materially modifying his plans. Haji Wali appears to have been somewhat of an *esprit fort*, and was entirely unencumbered, not only by prejudices, but it would seem by definite opinions of any kind. He advised Mr. Burton, in the first place, to lay aside the Dervish's gown, the large blue pantaloons, the short shirt, and every mark of connection with Persia or the Persians. No race is so unpopular in the East; and a traveller of that race would hardly fail to get into trouble. In Egypt they are hated and cursed on national grounds; in Arabia they are beaten and abused as heretics, and everywhere they are entirely without hope of sympathy or assistance. After long consultation, he resolved to put himself before the public as a *Pathan*, (the Indian designation of the Afghans,) born however in India

and long resident at Rangoon. This character to be sustained satisfactorily, required that the bearer should be acquainted with Persian, Hindostani and Arabic, all which languages Mr. Burton speaks fluently.

Secondly, he insisted on the propriety of his sinking as much as possible the character of the Dervish, and he advised him to put forward in preference the profession of an Indian doctor, travelling under a vow to visit all the holy places in Islam. It would be entirely out of keeping, the Haji well observed, with the profession of a reverend dervish to busy himself about those questions of politics or statistics regarding which Mr. Burton was so naturally anxious to obtain information; and the attempt would be sure to provoke suspicion. Henceforth, in conformity with this shrewd suggestion, our pilgrim appears in the mixed character of *Haji* (pilgrim) *Shaykh* (priestly personage) and *Hakim* (physician). His description of the eastern practice of physic is extremely amusing.

“When the mob has raised you to fame, patients of a better class will slowly appear on the scene. After some coquetting about ‘etiquette,’ whether you are to visit them, or they are to call upon you, they make up their minds to see you, and to judge with their eyes whether you are to be trusted or not; whilst you, on your side, set out with the determination that they shall at once cross the Rubicon,—in less classical phrase, swallow your drug. If you visit the house, you insist upon the patient’s servants attending you; he must also provide and pay an ass for your conveyance, no matter if it be only to the other side of the street. Your confidential man accompanies you, primed for replies to the ‘fifty searching questions’ of the ‘servant’s hall.’ You are lifted off the saddle tenderly, as nurses dismount their charges, when you arrive at the gate, and you waddle up stairs with dignity. Arrived at the sick room, you salute those present with a general ‘peace be upon you!’ to which they respond, ‘and upon you be the peace and the mercy of Allah, and his blessing!’ To the invalid you say, ‘There is nothing the matter, please Allah, except the health;’ to which the proper answer—for here every sign of ceremony has its countersign—is, ‘May Allah give thee health!’ You then sit down, and acknowledge the presence of the company by raising your right hand to your lips and forehead, bowing the while circularly; each individual returns the civility by a similar gesture. Then inquiry about the state of your health ensues. Then you are asked what refreshment you will take: you studiously mention something not likely to be in the house, but at last you rough it with a pipe and a cup of

coffee. Then you proceed to the patient, who extends his wrist, and asks you what his complaint is. Then you examine his tongue, you feel his pulse, you look learned, and—he is talking all the time—after hearing a detailed list of all his ailments, you gravely discover them, taking for the same as much praise to yourself as does the practising phrenologist, for a similar simple exercise of the reasoning faculties. The disease, to be respectable, must invariably be connected with one of the four temperaments, or the four elements, or the ‘humours of Hippocrates.’ Cure is easy, but it will take time, and you, the doctor, require attention; any little rudeness it is in your power to punish by an alteration in the pill, or the powder, and, so unknown is professional honour, that none will brave your displeasure. If you would pass for a native practitioner, you must then proceed to a most uncomfortable part of your visit, bargaining for fees. Nothing more effectually arouses suspicion than disinterestedness in a doctor. I once cured a rich Hazramaut merchant of rheumatism, and neglected to make him pay for treatment; he carried off one of my coffee cups, and was unceasingly wondering where I came from. So I made him produce five piastres, a shilling, which he threw upon the carpet, cursing Indian avarice. ‘You will bring on another illness,’ said my friend, the Haji when he heard of it.”—Vol. i. pp. 76-79.

His adventures at Cairo, and across the desert, though remarkably well described, have less of novelty than the part of the book devoted to the details of the pilgrimage, which may be said to commence at Suez, with his embarkation in the Pilgrim-ship for Yambu. He formed at this port an acquaintance with a party of travellers bound to the same destination, over whom, by judiciously yielding to their request for a loan, he obtained what afterwards proved a most serviceable influence; and although one of them, a sharp precocious Egyptian boy, named Mohammed, was alarmed by the sight of a sextant which Mr. Burton carried, and for a moment seemed to penetrate his disguise, yet Mr. Burton had so effectually imposed upon the rest by his skill in high Moslem theology, and by his otherwise unexceptionable “making up,” that they unanimously scouted the presumptuous sceptic as “a fakir, an owl, a cut-off one, a stranger, and a Wahhabi, for daring to impugn the faith of a brother believer.” Still the suspicion itself was enough to show the self-called pilgrim the perilous uncertainty in which he stood. He resolved with a sigh to part with the sextant, important as he felt it to be for his explorations, and the more effectually to lull all doubts of his orthodoxy, he put

on an extra look of piety, and prayed five times a day for nearly a week afterwards!

After considerable delay and some embarrassment about a passport at Suez, the pilgrim at length succeeded in securing a passage on board the *Silk el Zahab*, or “Golden Wire;” the chief agent in the transaction being one of the party alluded to above, and known by the expressive appellation, Saad el Jinni, “Saad the Devil.”

“Our Pilgrim Ship, the *Silk el Zahab*, or the ‘Golden Wire,’ was a *Sambuk*, of about 400 ardébs (fifty tons), with narrow wedge-like bows, a clean water line, a sharp keel, undecked, except upon the poop, which was high enough to act as a sail in a gale of wind. She carried two masts, imminently raking forward, the main considerably larger than the mizen; the former was provided with a huge triangular latine, very deep in the tack, but the second sail was unaccountably wanting. She had no means of reefing, no compass, no log, no sounding lines, nor even the suspicion of a chart; and in her box-like cabin and ribbed hold there was a something which savoured of close connection between her model and that of the Indian *Toni*. Such, probably were the craft which carried old *Sesostris* across the Red Sea to *Dire*; such the cruisers which once every three years left *Ezion-Geber* for *Tarshish*; such the transports of which 130 were required to convey *Ælius Gallus*, with his 10,000 men; and—the East moves slowly—such most probably in A. D. 1900 will be the ‘Golden Wire,’ which shall convey future pilgrims from Suez to *El-Hejaz*. ‘*Bakhshish*’ was the last as well as the first odious sound I heard in Egypt. The owner of the shore-boat would not allow us to climb the sides of our vessel before paying him his fare, and when we did so, he asked for *Bakhshish*. If *Easterus* would only imitate the example of Europeans,—I never yet saw an Englishman give *Bakhshish* to a soul,—the nuisance would soon be done away with. But on this occasion all my companions complied with the request, and at times it is unpleasant to be singular. The first look at the interior of our vessel showed a hopeless sight; for *Ali Murad*, the greedy owner, had promised to take sixty passengers in the hold, but had stretched the number to ninety-seven. Piles of boxes and luggage in every shape and form filled the ship from stem to stern, and a torrent of *Hajis* were pouring over the sides like ants into the Indian sugar-basin. The poop, too, where we had taken our places, was covered with goods, and a number of pilgrims had established themselves there by might, not by right.

“Presently, to our satisfaction, appeared Saad the Devil, equipped as an able seaman, and looking most unlike the proprietor of two large boxes full of valuable merchandise. This energetic individual instantly prepared for action. With our little party to back him,

he speedily cleared the poop of intruders and their stuff by the simple process of pushing or rather throwing them off it into the hold below. We then settled down as comfortably as we could; three Syrians, a married Turk with his wife and family, the rais or captain of the vessel, with a portion of his crew, and our seven selves, composing a total of eighteen human beings, upon a space certainly not exceeding 10 feet by 8. The cabin—a miserable box about the size of the poop, and three feet high—was stuffed, like the hold of a slave ship, with fifteen wretches, children and women, and the other ninety-seven were disposed upon the luggage or squatted on the bulwarks. Having some experience in such matters, and being favoured by fortune, I found a spare bed-frame slung to the ship's side; and giving a dollar to its owner, a sailor—who flattered himself that, because it was his, he would sleep upon it,—I instantly appropriated it, preferring any hardship outside to the condition of a packed herring inside the place of torment.”—Vol. i. pp. 276-279.

Even at the risk of detaining the reader too long from the Holy Land, we must transcribe the following description of an oriental row within the scanty precincts of a pilgrim ship.

“The first thing to be done after gaining standing-room was to fight for greater comfort; and never a Holyhead packet in the olden time showed a finer scene of pugnacity than did our pilgrim ship. A few Turks, ragged old men from Anatolia and Caramania, were mixed up with the Maghrabis, and the former began the war by contemptuously elbowing and scolding their wild neighbours. The Maghrabis, under their leader, ‘Maula Ali,’ a burly savage, in whom I detected a ridiculous resemblance to an old and well-remembered schoolmaster, retorted so willingly that in a few minutes nothing was to be seen but a confused mass of humanity, each item indiscriminately punching and pulling, scratching and biting, butting and trampling whatever was obnoxious to such operations, with cries of rage, and all the accompaniments of a proper fray. One of our party on the poop, a Syrian, somewhat incautiously leapt down to aid his countrymen by restoring order. He sank immediately below the surface of the living mass; and when we fished him out, his forehead was cut open, half his beard had disappeared, and a fine sharp set of teeth belonging to some Maghrabi had left their mark in the calf of his leg. The enemy showed no love of fair play, and never appeared contented unless five or six of them were setting upon a single man. This made matters worse. The weaker of course drew their daggers, and a few bad wounds were soon given and received. In a few minutes five men were completely disabled, and the victors began to dread the consequences of their victory.

"Then the fighting stopped, and as many could not find places, it was agreed that a deputation should wait upon Ali Murad, the owner, to inform him of the crowded state of the vessel. After keeping us in expectation at least three hours he appeared in a row-boat, and, preserving a respectful distance, informed us that any one who pleased might leave the ship and take back his fare. This left the case exactly as it was before; none would abandon his party to go on shore: so Ali Murad was rowed off towards Suez, giving us a parting injunction to be good, and not fight; to trust in Allah, and that Allah would make all things easy to us. His departure was the signal for a second fray, which in its accidents differed a little from the first. During the previous disturbance we kept our places with weapons in our hands. This time we were summoned by the Maghrabis to relieve their difficulties, by taking about half a dozen of them on the poop. Saad the Devil at once rose with an oath, and threw amongst us a bundle of 'Nebut'—goodly ashen staves six feet long, thick as a man's wrist, well greased, and tried in many a rough bout. He shouted to us 'Defend yourselves if you don't wish to be the meat of the Maghrabis!' and to the enemy 'Dogs and sons of dogs! now shall you see what the children of the Arab are,'—'I am Omar of Daghistan!' 'I am Abdullah the son of Joseph!' 'I am Saad the Devil!' we exclaimed, 'renowning it' by this display of name and patronymic. To do the enemy justice, they showed no sign of flinching; they swarmed towards the poop like angry hornets, and encouraged each other with loud cries of 'Allah akbar!' But we had a vantage ground about four feet above them, and their palm-sticks and short daggers could do nothing against our terrible quarter-staves. In vain the 'Jacquerie' tried to scale the poop and to overpower us by numbers; their courage only secured them more broken heads.

"At first I began to lay on load with *main morte*, really fearing to kill some one with such a weapon; but it soon became evident that the Maghrabis' heads and shoulders could bear and did require the utmost exertion of strength. Presently a thought struck me. A large earthen jar full of drinking water,—in its heavy frame of wood the weight might have been 100 lbs.,—stood upon the edge of the poop, and the thick of the fray took place beneath. Seeing an opportunity I crept up to the jar, and, without attracting attention, by a smart push with the shoulder rolled it down upon the swarm of assailants. The fall caused a shriller shriek to rise above the ordinary din, for heads, limbs, and bodies were sorely bruised by the weight, scratched by the broken potsherds, and wetted by the sudden discharge. A fear that something worse might be forthcoming made the Maghrabis shrink off towards the end of the vessel. After a few minutes, we, sitting in grave silence, received a deputation of individuals in whity-brown Burnooses, spotted and striped with what Mephistopheles calls a 'curious juice.' They solicited peace, which we granted upon the




condition that they would bind themselves to keep it. Our heads, shoulders, and hands were penitentially kissed, and presently the fellows returned to bind up their hurts in dirty rags."—Vol. i. pp. 281-285.

The miseries of such a voyage, with all its delays and interruptions, may well be imagined. Mr. Burton might have avoided most of it by hiring a ship for himself. But he wished to see pilgrim life in all its unsophisticated ruggedness; he wished, too, to avoid the risk of suspicion consequent on too great exclusiveness; and the (for a Haji,) very lavish expenditure—£40 or £50—on such an object, would go far to arouse doubts as to the genuineness of his pretensions.

The voyage from Suez to Yambu, a sea-port on the eastern coast of the Red Sea, occupied twelve days; and on the 18th of July our pilgrim set out as one of the ordinary caravan for Bir-Abbas, whence, on the 22nd of the same month, they commenced their route under all the glare of a July sun in the Desert, to Medinah. On the 25th, they reached that sanctuary of the world of Islam.

"Half an hour after leaving the 'blessed valley' we came to a huge flight of steps roughly cut in a long broad line of black scoriaceous basalt. This is called the Mudarraġ or flight of steps over the western ridge of the so-called El Harratain. It is holy ground; for the prophet spoke well of it. Arrived at the top we passed through a lane of black scoria, with steep banks on both sides, and after a few minutes a full view of the city suddenly opened upon us.


"We halted our beasts as if by word of command. All of us descended, in imitation of the pious of old, and sat down, jaded and hungry as we were, to feast our eyes with a view of the Holy City. 'O Allah! this is the Haram (sanctuary) of the Prophet; make it to us a protection from hell fire, and a refuge from eternal punishment! O open the gates of thy mercy, and let us pass through them to the land of joy!' and 'O Allah, bless the last of Prophets, the seal of prophecy, with blessings in number as the stars of heaven, and the waves of the sea, and the sands of the waste—bless him, O Lord of Might and Majesty, as long as the corn field and the date grove continue to feed mankind!' And again, 'Live for ever, O most excellent of Prophets!—live in the shadow of happiness during the hours of night and the times of day, whilst the bird of the tamarisk (the dove) moaneth like the childless mother, whilst the west wind bloweth gently over the hills of Nejd, and the lightning flasheth bright in the firmament of El Hejaz!' Such



were the poetical exclamations that rose all around me, showing how deeply tinged with imagination becomes the language of the Arab under the influence of strong passion or religious enthusiasm. I now understood the full value of a phrase in the Moslem ritual, 'And when his (the pilgrim's) eyes *fall upon the trees of El Medinah*, let him raise his voice and bless the Prophet with the choicest of blessings.' In all the fair view before us, nothing was more striking, after the desolation through which we had passed, than the gardens and orchards about the town. It was impossible not to enter into the spirit of my companions, and truly I believe that for some minutes my enthusiasm rose as high as theirs."—Vol. ii. pp. 24-7.

Mr. Burton took up his abode in the house of Shaykh Hamid, one of his travelling companions, where he remained during the whole period of his stay at Medinah. His diary of life at Medinah is too curious to be overlooked.

"At dawn we arose, washed, prayed, and broke our fast upon a crust of stale bread, before smoking a pipe, and drinking a cup of coffee. Then it was time to dress, to mount, and to visit the Haram in one of the holy places outside the city. Returning before the sun became intolerable, we sat together, and with conversation, shishas and chibouques, coffee, and cold water perfumed with mastich-smoke, we whiled away the time till our *ariston*, an early dinner, which appeared at the primitive hour of 11 A.M. The meal, here called El Ghada, was served in the *majlis* on a large copper tray, sent from the upper apartments. Ejaculating 'Bismillah'—the Moslem grace—we all sat round it, and dipped equal hands in the dishes set before us. We had usually unleavened bread, different kinds of meat and vegetable stews, and at the end of the first course plain boiled rice, eaten with spoons; then came the fruits, fresh dates, grapes, and pomegranates. After dinner I used invariably to find some excuse—such as the habit of a 'Kaylulah' (mid-day siesta) or the being a 'Saudawi,' or person of melancholy temperament, to have a rug spread in the dark passage behind the *majlis*, and there to lie reading, dozing, smoking or writing, *en cachette*, in complete *deshabille* all through the worst part of the day, from noon to sunset. Then came the hour for receiving or paying visits. We still kept up an intimacy with Omar Effendi, and Saad the Devil, although Salih Skakkar and Amm Jemal, either disliking our society, or perhaps thinking our sphere of life too humble for their dignity, did not appear once in Hamid's house. The evening prayers ensued, either at home or in the Haram, followed by our *Asha* 'deipnon,' or supper, another substantial meal like the dinner, but more plentiful, of bread, meat, vegetables, plain rice and fruits, concluding with the invari-



able pipes and coffee. To pass our *soirée*, we occasionally dressed in common clothes, shouldered a *nebút*, and went to the *café*; sometimes on festive occasions we indulged in a *Taatumah* (or *Itmiyah*), a late supper of sweetmeats, pomegranates and dried fruits. Usually we sat upon mattresses spread upon the ground in the open air at the *Shaykh's* door, receiving evening visits, chatting, telling stories, and making merry, till each, as he felt the approach of the drowsy god, sank down into his proper place, and fell asleep."—Vol. ii. 48-51.

The note-taking alluded to in the above passage was not without its peril. His note-book was composed of long slips of paper, and made to fit in the breast of his gown without being seen. At first he wrote his notes in Arabic, in order to avoid the risk of discovery; but after a time, emboldened by impunity, he continued them in English. In all cases, however, they were made with great caution and privacy.

The holiness of El Medinah in the eyes of devout Moslems is, of course, drawn from its connection with their Prophet's history, and from the memorials of him which it contains. The chief of these is his tomb, about which, as a centre, the whole cycle of Moslem devotion revolves. The *Masjid el Nabawi*, or Prophet's Mosque, which encloses the tomb, is one of the two chief Sanctuaries of Islam; and in the eyes of the true Mahomedan is at least the second, if not the first, of the three most venerable temples in the world, the other two being the Mosque at Meccah and that at Jerusalem. A division of opinion exists among Moslem doctors as to the relative sanctity of Medinah and Meccah; but there is almost a consent in favour of the *Bait Allah*, or House of God, in the latter, while all admit that El Medinah is more venerable than any other part of Meccah, excepting only the *Bait Allah*.

The Prophet's Mosque at Medinah is an open parallelogram about 420 feet long by 340 broad, the court or central area being very spacious, and surrounded by a peristyle, with numerous rows of pillars.* In the southern

* We may here notice a strange mistake of Mr. Burton's as to the relative size of the great churches of the world. He places St. Sophia's, now the Mosque at Constantinople, first upon the list; whereas it hardly deserves to be named at all in comparison with any of the great Western churches, and is scarcely one half the size of St. Peter's at Rome.

end of the building are collected all the relics to which its chief sources of venerableness are referable. The great object of veneration, of course, is the Prophet's Tomb, which stands in what is called the Hujrah, or chamber, from the circumstance of its having been Ayisha's room.

“ It is an irregular square of from 50 to 55 feet in the S. E. corner of the building, and separated on all sides from the walls of the mosque by a passage about 26 feet broad on the S. side, and 20 on the eastern. The reason of this isolation has been before explained, and there is a saying of Mohammed's, ‘ O Allah cause not my tomb to become an object of idolatrous adoration ! May Allah's wrath fall heavy upon the people who make the tombs of their prophets places of prayer ! ’ Inside there are, or are supposed to be, three tombs facing the south, surrounded by stone walls without any aperture, or, as others say, by strong planking. Whatever this material may be, it is hung outside with a curtain, somewhat like a large four-post bed. The outer railing is separated by a dark narrow passage from the inner one, which it surrounds, and is of iron filagree painted of a vivid grass green,—with a view to the garden,—whilst carefully inserted in the verdure, and doubly bright by contrast, is the gilt or burnished brass work forming the long and graceful letters of the Suls character, and disposed into the Moslem creed, the profession of unity, and similar religious sentences. On the south side, for greater honour, the railing is plated over with silver, and silver letters are interlaced with it. This fence, which connects the columns and forbids passage to all men, may be compared to the baldacchino of Roman churches. It has four gates: that to the south is the Bab el Muwajihah ; eastward is the gate of our Lady Fatimah ; westward the Bab el Taubah, (of repentance,) opening into the Rauzah or garden, and to the north, the Bab el Shami or Syrian gate. They are constantly kept closed, except the fourth, which admits, into the dark narrow passage above alluded to, the officers who have charge of the treasures there deposited, and the eunuchs who sweep the floor, light the lamps, and carry away the presents sometimes thrown in here by devotees. In the southern side of the fence are three windows, holes about half a foot square, and placed from four to five feet above the ground ; they are said to be between threes and four cubits distance from the Prophet's head. The most westerly of these is supposed to front Mohammed's tomb, wherefore it is called the Shubák el Nabi, or the Prophet's window. The next, on the right as you front it, is Abubekr's, and the most easterly of the three is Omar's. Above the Hujrah is the Green Dome, surmounted outside by a large gilt crescent springing from a series of globes.”—Vol. ii. pp. 72-4.

This chamber is said to contain the tombs not only of

Mahomet, but also of his two immediate successors, Abubekr and Omar. It is popularly believed now to contain only space for one other grave, which is reserved, they suppose, for Isa ben Maryam, (our Blessed Lord,) at his second coming upon earth. These tombs, however, are all screened off by the Kiswah, or brocaded curtain, with embroidered inscriptions, announcing that within are laid the Prophet and the first two caliphs. A large pearl rosary, moreover, and a peculiar ornament—a cluster of brilliant pearls, called Kaubab el Durri—are attached to the curtain, to indicate the precise spot where the body of the Prophet himself reposes.

The popular notion as to the Prophet's coffin being, by some ingenious contrivance, suspended in the air, is an example of the extent to which an error, once obtaining currency, may be maintained and perpetuated. There is not the least foundation in reality for such a notion; and it is conjectured by Niebuhr that it may possibly have obtained currency in the first instance through the impression conveyed to strangers by the rude drawings of the Hujrah sold to the pilgrims, in which all the laws of perspective are so utterly ignored, that the idea of the coffin's being suspended in the air might not unreasonably arise in the enthusiastic pilgrim's mind. Once created, this notion might remain long without correction. No visitor ever approached the tomb. Even when dust had accumulated upon it, it was removed not by the ordinary process of cleansing, but by letting down, through a hole in the roof, some man celebrated for his piety, to sweep the tomb with his beard! Most of the historians are entirely silent regarding its appearance, and the few accounts of it which have been preserved, can hardly be reconciled with each other. The most reliable seems to be that of El Samanhudi, quoted by Burckhardt; who says that beneath the brocaded curtain already described, is a square building of black stones, in the interior of which rest the tombs of Mahomet and his two successors, these tombs being deep holes, and the coffin which contains the remains of the prophet being cased with silver, and bearing the inscription, *Bismillah! Allahumma salli alayh!* (In the name of Allah! Allah have mercy on him!)

Besides the Prophet's Tomb, the Mosque contains various other objects and places of high veneration for the Moslem; as the place of the Angel Gabriel's Revelations; the

grave of the Lady Fatimah, (Mahomet's daughter); the memorials of the early martyrs of Islam, and those of the "Mothers of the Moslem," by which name are designated the fifteen wives of the Prophet. The colonnades of the open court, too, possess their own attraction for the devotees. There is the Pillar of Lots, the Weeping Pillar, the Pillar of Repentance, each of which enters into the circle of the pilgrim's laborious devotion. The Lady Fatimah's garden, and the puny date trees which it contains, are special objects of religious honour, and the fruit of these sacred trees is sold in infinitesimal quantities, and at a large price, to be carried home by the pilgrims.

How these, and all the other complicated details of the Ziyarat, (or visitation,) were punctiliously observed by our Haji, we shall best explain in his own words.

"But this is not the time for Tafarruj, or lionising. Shaykh Hamid warns me with a nudge, that other things are expected of a Zair. He leads me to the Bab el Salam, fighting his way through a troop of beggars, and inquires markedly if I am religiously pure. Then, placing our hands a little below and on the left of the waist, the palm of the right covering the back of the left, in the position of prayer, and beginning with the right feet, we pace slowly forwards down the line called the Muwajihat el Sharifah, or 'the Holy Fronting,' which, divided off by an aisle, runs parallel with the southern wall of the mosque. On my right hand walked the Shaykh, who recited aloud the following prayer, which I repeated after him. It is literally rendered, as, indeed, are all the formulæ, and the reader is requested to excuse the barbarous fidelity of the translation. 'In the name of Allah and in the Faith of Allah's Prophet! O Lord cause me to enter the entering of Truth, and cause me to issue forth the issuing of Truth, and permit me to draw near to thee, and make me a Sultan Victorious!' Then followed blessings upon the Prophet, and afterwards: 'O Allah! open to me the doors of thy mercy, and grant me entrance into it, and protect me from the Stoned Devil!'

"During this preliminary prayer we had passed down two-thirds of the Muwajihat el Sharifah. On the left hand is a dwarf wall, about the height of a man, painted with arabesques, and pierced with four small doors which open into the Muwajihat. In this barrier are sundry small erections, the niche called the Mihrab Sulaymani, the Mambar, or pulpit, and the Mihrab el Nabawi. The two niches are of beautiful mosaic, richly worked with various coloured marbles, and the pulpit is a graceful collection of slender columns, elegant tracery, and inscriptions admirably carved. Arrived at the western small door in the dwarf wall, we entered the

celebrated spot called El Rauzah, or the Garden, after a saying of the Prophet's, 'between my Tomb and my Pulpit is a Garden of the Gardens of Paradise.' On the north and west sides it is not divided from the rest of the portico; on the south lies the dwarf wall, and on the east it is limited by the west end of the lattice-work containing the tomb. Accompanied by my *Muzawwir* I entered the Rauzah, and was placed by him with the Mukabbariyah behind me, fronting Meccah, with my right shoulder opposite to and about twenty feet distant from the dexter pillar of the Prophet's Pulpit. There, after saying the afternoon prayers, I performed the usual two prostrations in honour of the temple, and at the end of them recited the 109th and the 112th chapters of the Koran—the 'Kul ya ayyuha'l Kafiruna,' and the 'Surat el Ikhlas, called also the 'Kul Huw Allah,' or the Declaration of Unity; and may be thus translated:

"1. 'Say, He is the one God!'

"2. 'The eternal God!'

"3. 'He begets not, nor is he begot,'

"4. 'And unto him the like is not.'

"After which was performed a single *Sujdah* of thanks, in gratitude to Allah for making it my fate to visit so holy a spot."—Vol. ii. pp. 62-67.

There is a great deal more of this strange mockery with which we shall not trouble the reader. It will be enough to say that, not only here, but in all the visitations of the holy places in the environs of Medinah, Haji Abdullah was found amongst the most laborious and the most exact of the crowd of worshippers. His narrative contains a faithful translation of all the prayers, salutations, testifications, ejaculations, and other formularies which he recited at their respectively prescribed places of pilgrimage!

After he had thus performed all the duties of a good Zair, he was at liberty to indulge a little in sight-seeing. For the full description of the Mosque, as well as for a very curious history of the building, with all its vicissitudes since the days of the Prophet, we must of course refer the reader to the volumes themselves. Mr. Burton has illustrated his description by a general plan of the city, a ground plan of the mosque, and several carefully executed lithographs. These are intended either to supply the defects of Burckhardt's illustrations, or to correct certain errors in them. Mr. Burton assures us that the views of the Holy City, such as they appear in our popular books, are ludicrously incorrect.

Mr. Burton entertains grave doubts as to the truth of

the popular belief which regards the Hujrah as the place of the Prophet's sepulchre. We must say, however, that the grounds of his scepticism are by no means conclusive.

"It must be remembered that a great tumult followed the announcement of the Prophet's death, when the people, as often happens, believing him to be immortal, refused to credit the report, and even Omar threatened destruction to any one who asserted it. Moreover the body was scarcely cold when the contest about the succession arose between the fugitives of Meccah and the auxiliaries of El Medinah: in the ardour of which, according to the Shiahs, the house of Ali and Fatimah,—within a few feet of the spot where the tomb of the Prophet is now placed—was threatened with fire, and that Abubekr was elected caliph that same evening. If any one find cause to wonder that the last resting-place of a personage so important was not fixed for ever, he may find a parallel case in El Medinah. To quote no other, three places claim the honour of containing the Lady Fatimah's mortal spoils, although one might suppose that the daughter of the Prophet and the mother of the Imams would not be laid in an unknown grave. My reasons for incredulity are the following:

"1. From the earliest days the shape of the Prophet's tomb has never been generally known in El Islam. For this reason it is that graves are made convex in some countries, and flat in others: had there been a Sunnat, this would not have been the case.

"2. The discrepant accounts of the learned. El Samanhudi, perhaps the highest authority, contradicts himself. In one place he describes the coffin; in another he expressly declares that he entered the Hujrah when it was being repaired by Kaid-bey, and saw in the inside three deep graves, but no traces of tombs. Either, then, the mortal remains of the Prophet had—despite Moslem superstition—mingled with the dust, (a probable circumstance after nearly 900 years' interment,) or, what is more likely, they had been removed by the Shiah schismatics, who for centuries had charge of the sepulchre.

"3. And lastly, I cannot but look upon the tale of the blinding light which surrounds the Prophet's tomb, and now universally believed upon the authority of the attendant eunuchs, who must know its falsehood, as a priestly gloss intended to conceal a defect."—Vol. ii. pp. 108-11.

The mosque of El Medinah was first built by Mahomet himself, on the spot where his she-camel, El Haseva, knelt down by order of heaven. It has since been four times rebuilt, receiving successive additions from the progressive piety or munificence of the Moslem world. To it the citizens of Medinah (who number about 16,000, or

18,000,) are almost entirely indebted for means of subsistence. The yearly number of pilgrims has decreased very much since the days of Lodovico Bartema, who estimates the Damascus caravan alone at 40,000. But it still amounts to many thousands annually. Mr. Burton supposes the pilgrims of the Damascus caravan to be about 7,000 of both sexes, and all ages ; and although the absolute expenditure of each there must be something far below what it would be in a Western city, yet, relatively to the habits of the population, the total must be regarded as a proportionately important accession to their local resources. The arrival of the Damascus pilgrim caravan of 1853 is most graphically described by Mr. Burton.

“I arose in the morning and looked out from the windows of the *majlis*: the Barr el Munakhah, from a dusty waste dotted with a few Bedouins and hair tents, had assumed all the various shapes and the colours of a kaleidoscope. The eye was bewildered by the shifting of innumerable details, in all parts totally different from one another, thrown confusedly together in one small field ; and, however jaded with sight-seeing, it dwelt with delight upon the vivacity, the variety, and the intense picturesqueness of the scene. In one night had sprung up a town of tents of every size, colour, and shape,—round, square, and oblong,—open and closed,—from the shawl lined and gilt-topped pavilion of the pacha, with all the luxurious appurtenances of the Haram, to its neighbour the little dirty green ‘rowtie’ of the tobacco-seller. They were pitched in admirable order : here ranged in a long line, where a street was required ; there packed in dense masses, where thoroughfares were unnecessary. But how describe the utter confusion in the crowding, the bustling, and the vast variety and volume of sound ? Huge white Syrian dromedaries, compared with those of El Hejaz appeared mere poney-camels, jingling large bells, and bearing shugdufs like miniature green tents, swaying and tossing upon their backs ; gorgeous Takhtrawan, or litters borne between camels or mules with scarlet and brass trappings ; Bedouins bestriding naked-backed ‘Deluls,’ and clinging like apes to the hairy humps ; Arnaut, Turkish, and Kurd irregular horsemen, fiercer looking in their mirth than Roman peasants in their rage ; fainting Persian pilgrims, forcing their stubborn dromedaries to kneel, or dismounted grumbling from jaded donkeys ; Kahwagis, sherbert sellers, and ambulant tobacconists crying their goods ; country-people driving flocks of sheep and goats with infinite clamour through lines of horses fiercely suorting and rearing ; towns-people seeking their friends ; returned travellers exchanging affectionate salutes ; devout Hajis jolting one another, running under the legs of camels, and tumbling over the tents’ ropes in their hurry to reach the Haram ;

cannon roaring from the citadel ; shopmen, water-carriers and fruit vendors fighting over their bargains ; boys bullying heretics with loud screams ; a well-mounted party of fine old Arab Shaykhs of Hamidah clan, preceded by their varlets, performing the Arzah or war dance,—compared with which the Pyrenean bear's performance is grace itself,—firing their duck guns upwards, or blowing the powder into the calves of those before them, brandishing their swords, leaping frantically the while, with their bright-coloured rags floating in the wind, tossing their long spears tufted with ostrich feathers high in the air, reckless where they fall ; servants seeking their masters, and masters their tents with vain cries of Ya Mohammed ; grandees riding mules or stalking on foot, preceded by their crowd-beaters, shouting to clear the way ;—here the loud shrieks of women and children, whose litters are bumping and rasping against one another ;—there the low moaning of some poor wretch that is seeking a shady corner to die in : add a thick dust which blurs the outlines like a London fog, with a flaming sun that draws sparkles of fire from the burnished weapons of the crowd, and the brass balls of tent and litter ; and—I doubt, gentle reader, that even the length, the jar, and the confusion of this description is adequate to its subject, or that any word-painting of mine can convey a just idea of the scene.”—Vol. ii. pp. 224-7.

Mr. Burton's description of the piety of the pilgrims, though very striking, is not so highly coloured as that which we find in other books of Eastern travel.

“ In the evening I went with my friends to the Haram. The minaret galleries were hung with lamps, and the inside of the temple was illuminated. It was crowded with Hajis, amongst whom were many women, a circumstance which struck me from its being unusual. Some pious pilgrims, who had duly paid for the privilege, were perched upon ladders trimming wax candles of vast dimensions, others were laying up for themselves rewards in paradise, by performing the same office to the lamps ; many were going through the ceremonies of Ziyarat, and not a few were sitting in different parts of the mosque apparently overwhelmed with emotion. The boys and the beggars were inspired with fresh energy, the Aghawat were gruffer, and surlier than I had ever seen them, and the young men about town walked and talked with a freer and an easier demeanour than usual. My old friends the Persians—there were about 1200 of them in the Hajj caravan—attracted my attention. The doorkeepers stopped them with curses as they were about to enter, and all claimed from each the sum of five piastres, whilst other Moslems are allowed to enter the mosque free. Unhappy men ! they had lost all the Shiraz swagger, their mustachios drooped pitiaibly, their eyes would not look any one in the face, and not a head bore a cap stuck upon it crookedly. Whenever an

'Ajemi,' whatever might be his rank, stood in the way of an Arab or a Turk, he was rudely thrust aside, with abuse, muttered loud enough to be heard by all around. All eyes followed them as they went through the ceremonies of Ziyarat, especially as they approached the tombs of Abubekr and Omar,—which every man is bound to defile if he can,—and the supposed place of Fatimah's burial. Here they stood in parties, after praying before the Prophet's window: one read from a book the pathetic tale of the Lady's life, sorrows, and mourning death, whilst the others listened to him with breathless attention. Sometimes their emotion was too strong to be repressed. '*Ay Fatimah! Ay Mazlumah! Way! Way!*—O Fatimah! O thou injured one! Alas! alas!'—burst involuntarily from their lips, despite the danger of such exclamations, tears trickled down their hairy cheeks, and their brawny bosoms heaved with sobs. A strange sight it was to see rugged fellows, mountaineers perhaps, or the fierce Iliyat of the plains, sometimes weeping silently like children, sometimes shrieking like hysteric girls, and utterly careless to conceal a grief so coarse and grisly, at the same time so true and real, that we knew not how to behold it. Then the Satanic scowls with which they passed by or pretended to pray at the hated Omar's tomb! With what curses their hearts are belying those mouths full of blessings! How they are internally canonising Fayruz, and praying for his eternal happiness in the presence of the murdered man! Sticks and stones, however, and not unfrequently the knife and the sabre, have taught them the hard lesson of disciplining their feelings, and nothing but a furious contraction of the brow, a roll of the eye, intensely vicious, and a twitching of the muscles about the region of the mouth, denotes the wild storm of wrath within. They generally, too, manage to discharge some part of their passion in words. 'Hail Omar thou hog!' exclaims some fanatic Madani as he passes by the heretic—a demand more outraging than requiring a red-hot, black-north Protestant to bless the Pope. 'O Allah! *hell* him!' meekly responds the Persian, changing the benediction to a curse most intelligible to, and most delicious in his fellows' ears."—Vol. ii. pp. 249-52.

The personal expenditure of the pilgrims, however, is only one of the sources of the religious revenues of Medinah; sums of money, in the shape of alms, are forwarded annually from Constantinople and Cairo, and although Mr. Burton could not ascertain the exact amount, yet it is believed to be considerable. Bequests, donations, and other offerings have been made from time to time, and the treasury of the mosque, although not unfrequently plundered, or applied to state uses by the successive rulers of El Medinah, still possesses a certain accumulation of wealth, which is applied to the religious uses of the

Mosque and to the general maintenance of the establishment.

The head of this body is styled Shaykh El Haram, or "Chief of the Sanctuary." Formerly this officer was always an eunuch; but it is no longer so, and the present occupant of the post is Osman Pacha, who enjoys a salary of about 30,000 piastres a month. Almost all the other officials are eunuchs, although, generally speaking, they are married, and some of them have as many as three and four wives. Besides these, there are a number of free servants, called *Farrashin*, attached to the mosque. Almost all the middle and lower class of citizens belong to this order, and each, during his term of duty, receives a Ghazi, or twenty-two piastres for his services. Their duties are to trim lamps, to dust the building, to spread carpets, &c. The more menial offices are performed by a band of about fifty servitors, under an officer called *Shaykh el Sakka*, the chief of the water-carriers.

Besides this, which we may call the material establishment of the mosque, there is also a literary staff still more numerous; and to complete the connexions of the whole body of the citizens with the service of the mosque, Mr. Burton tells us that almost all who are not directly employed in its public service, at least qualify themselves to earn, or to eke out a livelihood as *Muzawwirs*, or what may be termed, religious ciceroni.

"They begin as boys to learn the formula of prayer, and the conducting of visitors, and partly by begging, partly by boldness, they often pick up a tolerable livelihood at an early age. The Muzawwir will often receive strangers into his house, as was done to me, and direct their devotions during the whole time of their stay. For this he requires a sum of money proportioned to his guests' circumstances, but this fee does not end the connection. If the Muzawwir visit the home of his Zair, he expects to be treated with the utmost hospitality, and to depart with a handsome present. A religious visitor will often transmit to his cicerone at Meccah and at El Medinah yearly sums to purchase for himself a mass at the Kaabah and the Prophet's Tomb. The remittance is usually wrapped up in paper, and placed in a sealed leathern bag, somewhat like a portfolio, upon which is worked the name of the person entitled to receive it. It is then placed in charge either of a trustworthy pilgrim, or of the public treasurer, who accompanies the principal caravans."—Vol. ii. p. 160.

From all this it will easily be inferred that commerce is at a discount in El Medinah.

“ Without these advantages El Medinah would soon be abandoned to cultivators and Bedouins. Though commerce is here honourable, as everywhere in the East, business is ‘slack,’ because the higher classes prefer the idleness of administering their landed estates, and being servants to the mosque. I heard of only four respectable houses, El Isawi, El Shaab, Abdel Jawwad, and a family from El Shark. They all deal in grain, cloth, and provisions, and perhaps the richest have a capital of 20,000 dollars. Caravans in the cold weather are constantly passing between El Medinah and Egypt, but they are rather bodies of visitors to Constantinople than traders travelling for gain. Corn is brought from Jeddah by land, and imported into Yambu or El Rais, a port on the Red Sea, one day and a half’s journey from Safra. There is an active provision trade with the neighbouring Bedouins, and the Syrian Hajj supplies the citizens with apparel and articles of luxury—tobacco, dried fruits, sweetmeats, knives, and all that is included under the word ‘notions.’ There are few store-keepers, and their dealings are petty, because articles of every kind are brought from Egypt, Syria, and Constantinople. As a general rule, labour is exceedingly expensive, and at the visitation time a man will demand fifteen or twenty piastres from a stranger for such a trifling job as mending an umbrella. Handicraftsmen and artisans—carpenters, masons, locksmiths, potters and others, are either slaves or foreigners, mostly Egyptians. This proceeds partly from the pride of the people. They are taught from their childhood that the Madani is a favoured being, to be respected however vile or schismatic, and that the vengeance of Allah will fall upon any one who ventures to abuse, much more to strike him. They receive a stranger at the shop window with the haughtiness of Pachas, and take pains to show him by words as well as by looks, that they consider themselves as ‘good gentlemen as princes, only not so rich.’ Added to this pride are indolence, and the true Arab prejudice, which, even in the present day, prevents a Bedouin from marrying the daughter of an artisan. Like Castilians they consider labour humiliating to any but a slave; nor is this, as a clever French author remarks, by any means an unreasonable idea, since Heaven, to punish man for disobedience, caused him to eat daily bread by the sweat of his brow. Besides, there is degradation, moral and physical, in handiwork compared with the freedom of the desert. The loom and the file do not conserve courtesy and chivalry like the sword and spear; man extending his tongue, to use an Arab phrase, when a cuff and not a stab is to be the consequence of an injurious expression. Even the ruffian becomes polite in California, where his brother ruffian carries a revolver, and those European nations who were most polished when every

gentleman wore a rapier have become the rudest since Civilization disarmed them."—Vol. ii. pp. 265-68.

A word on the dietary and domestic arrangements of the Madani.

"The citizens, despite their being generally in debt, manage to live well. Their cookery, like that of Meccah, has borrowed something from Egypt, Turkey, Syria, Persia, and India; like all Orientals they are exceedingly fond of clarified butter. I have seen the boy Mohammed drink off nearly a tumbler full, although his friends warned him that it would make him as fat as an elephant. When a man cannot enjoy clarified butter in these countries, it is considered a sign that his stomach is out of order, and all my excuses of a melancholic temperament were required to be in full play to prevent the infliction of fried meat swimming in grease, or that guest-dish, rice saturated with melted—perhaps I should say—rancid butter. The 'Samn' of El Hejaz, however, is often fresh, being brought in by the Bedouins; it has not therefore the foul flavour derived from the old and impregnated skin-bag which distinguishes the ghee of India. The house of a Madani in good circumstances is comfortable, for the building is substantial, and the attendance respectable. Black slave-girls here perform the complicated duties of servant-maids in England; they are taught to sew, to cook, and to wash, besides sweeping the house and drawing water for domestic use. Hasinah (the 'Charmer,' a decided misnomer,) costs from 40 to 50 dollars: if she be a mother, her value is less, but neathandedness, propriety of demeanour, and skill in feminine accomplishments, raise her to 100 dollars, £25. A little black boy, perfect in all his points, and tolerably intelligent, costs about 1000 piastres; girls are dearer, and eunuchs fetch double that sum. The older the children become, the more their value diminishes, and no one would purchase, save under exceptional circumstances, an adult slave, because he is never parted with but for some incurable vice. The Abyssinian, mostly Galla, girls, so much prized because their skins are always cool in the hottest weather, are here rare; they seldom sell for less than 20*l.*, and often fetch 60*l.* I never heard of a Jariyah Bayza, a white slave girl, being in the market at El Medinah: in Circassia they fetch from 100*l.* to 400*l.* prime cost, and few men in El Hejaz could afford so expensive a luxury. The bazaar at El Medinah is poor, and as almost all the slaves are brought from Meccah by the Jallabs, or drivers, after exporting the best to Egypt, the town receives only the refuse."—Vol. ii. pp. 268-272.

The reader will be curious, too, to learn something of the morality of the Sacred City of Islam.

“It is not to be believed that in a town garrisoned by Turkish troops, full of travelled traders, and which supports itself by plundering Hajis, the primitive virtues of the Arab could exist. The Meccans, a dark people, say of the Madani that their hearts are black as their skins are white. This is of course exaggerated; but it is not too much to assert that pride, pugnacity, a peculiar point of honour, and a vindictiveness of wonderful force and patience, are the only characteristic traits of Arab character which the citizens of El Medinah habitually display. Here you meet with scant remains of the chivalry of the desert. A man will abuse his guest, even though he will not dine without him, and would protect him bravely against an enemy. And words often pass lightly between individuals which suffice to cause a blood feud amongst Bedouins. The outward appearance of decorum is conspicuous amongst the Madani. There are no places where Corinthians dwell, as at Meccah, Cairo, and Jeddah. Adultery, if detected, would be punished by lapidation, according to the rigour of the Koranic law, and simple immorality by religious stripes, or, if of repeated occurrence, by expulsion from the city. But scandals seldom occur, and the women, I am told, behave with great decency. Abroad, they have the usual Moslem pleasures of marriage, lyings-in, circumcision feasts, holy visitations, and funerals. At home they employ themselves with domestic matters, and especially in scolding ‘Hasinah’ and ‘Zaaferan.’ In this occupation they surpass even the notable English housekeeper of the middle orders of society—the latter being confined to ‘knagging at’ her slave, whereas the Arab lady is allowed an unbounded extent of vocabulary. At Shaykh Hamid’s house, however, I cannot accuse the women of

“‘Swearing into strong shudders
The immortal gods who heard them.’

“They abused the black girls with unction, but without any violent expletives. At Meccah, however, the old lady in whose house I was living would, when excited by the melancholy temperament of her eldest son, and his irregular hours of eating, scold him in the grossest terms not unfrequently ridiculous in the extreme. For instance, one of her assertions was that he—the son—was the offspring of an immoral mother; which assertion, one might suppose, reflected not indirectly upon herself. So in Egypt I have frequently heard a father, when reproving his boy, address him by ‘O dog, son of a dog!’ and ‘O spawn of an infidel—of a Jew—of a Christian.’ Amongst the men of El Medinah I remarked a considerable share of hypocrisy. Their mouths were as full of religious salutations, exclamations, and hacknied quotations from the Koran as of indecency and vile abuse,—a point in which they resemble the Persians. As before observed, they preserve their reputation as the

sons of a holy city by praying only in public. At Constantinople they are by no means remarkable for sobriety. Intoxicating liquors, especially araki, are made in El Medinah only by the Turks: the citizens seldom indulge in this way at home, as detection by smell is imminent among a people of water-bibbers."—Vol. ii. pp. 280-84.

Mr. Burton had originally intended to proceed from El Medinah direct across to Muscat, from which city, in former times, a caravan regularly set out for the pilgrimage. Finding that this usage had long been discontinued, he proposed to undertake the journey in Bedouin fashion; and had formed, in this view, a friendship with one of his fellow travellers from Yambu, called by the ominous name, Mujrim, or "the Sinful." Mujrim undertook to procure for him all possible information as to the route, and at last almost consented to be his travelling companion. But in the end, he frankly avowed that no traveller, not even a native Bedouin, could at that time safely undertake a journey in the proposed direction; and as it was impossible to proceed alone, Mr. Burton reluctantly contented himself with the less adventurous route to Meccah. The details of this journey are reserved for his third and concluding volume.

In parting from this amusing and most instructive writer—incomparably the greatest master of Oriental life and manners since Mr. Lane—we must express our very sincere regret that so cultivated and liberal a scholar should have deformed more than one of his pages by coarse and vulgar sneers and insinuations, which must cause deep pain, not alone to every Catholic, but we might add, to almost every religious mind. We shall not stop to particularize the statements and expressions of which we complain. But their presence, as well as a certain vague and unavowed lightness of tone and sentiment on religious subjects, which occasionally makes itself felt rather than ostentatiously displays itself, have been a serious drawback on the otherwise unmixed pleasure with which we have read the *Pilgrimage to El Medinah*.

ART. IV.—*Clément XIII. et Clément XIV.*, par le PÈRE DE RAVIGNAN,
De la Compagnie de Jésus. Paris : Julien. Lanier et Cie. 1854.

IN a former number of this Journal, under the head of "Theory of Jesuit History," we speculated somewhat at large upon the features of Jesuit character and incidents of Jesuit life, which have given rise to such a diversity and conflict of opinion; and we ventured some timid notions of our own regarding that Society, which for the last three hundred years has filled the world with its action, its successes, its disasters, and finally its extinction and revival. In doing so we had occasion to notice, though very cursorily, Fr. Theiner's *Life of Clement XIV.*, the interest of which is necessarily concentrated upon the suppression of the Jesuits by that Pontiff, and while giving to the eminent author full credit for the spirit at once of candour and of charity in which we believe his work to have been undertaken, we felt it our duty to observe, that whether by a fatality attendant on the subject he had proposed to deal with, or by the mere imperfection of human nature, even in its finest developments, the book was of a character to lead to misconception, and give currency to error; that it was likely to work pain or pleasure in the wrong men, and be oftenest effective in the wrong places; that it would recoil on the friends of truth more damagingly than it could advance upon her enemies, and that it was peculiarly liable to perversion by the malignant and designing. In confirmation of our views upon the last particular, we had only to quote from the pamphlet of a Swiss ecclesiastic, named Leu, purporting to give the substance and spirit of Fr. Theiner's book, and which we are not called upon to notice further at present, the more especially as the author has made submission in the proper quarter upon other subjects, and may therefore be charitably presumed to have corrected some, at least, of his ideas upon this. It was our wish, however, in the few and possibly crude conceptions we drew together upon a subject embarrassed by so many difficulties, to have as broad a basis as might be for our theory, and therefore,

fearful of appearing to found it upon any one phase of Jesuit history, such as the pontificate of Clement XIV., and, moreover, not finding in Fr. Theiner's work any peculiarity of view it might be necessary to examine, as a new theory; we did not think it within the scope of our task at the moment to enter at large into the discussion of his work. Our own view, whatever it be worth, was nothing very original, ascribing, as it did, the fortunes, good and evil, of the society, the sympathy and antipathy it provoked, to its very constitutions and functions; treating its successes and disasters not as accidents of its position, but as conditions of its existence; on the simple ground that being a militant, and consequently, according to the slang of the time, an aggressive body, always in active service, and operating against all enemies of the Church and of authority generally, it could not fail to attract the hostility of every enemy, whether of religion or of order. This is the view taken by the Père de Ravignan in his "*Times of Clement XIII. and XIV.*," elicited by Fr. Theiner's work, rather than written in opposition to it, for the Père de Ravignan does not profess to argue but merely to narrate. Having laid down his thesis, which we shall come to presently, and which is, in truth, a contraction, perhaps we ought to say a condensation of our own, he proceeds to detail his facts, and remits their application to the discretion of the reader, a course he probably thinks most conformable to the spirit of the motto he has chosen for the book, "*Les Papes n'ont besoin que de la vérité.*"

The appearance of the work before us is undoubtedly due, as we have said, and as is admitted by Father de Ravignan, to the previous appearance of Fr. Theiner's history of Clement XIV. although the author disclaims any intention of putting it forward as a refutation of what is contained in that volume, and is unwilling that any one should attach a controversial or polemical character to his pages. It requires, however, a rather powerful faculty of abstraction to regard it precisely and to all intents in this light. To do the Père de Ravignan justice, and to enter fully into his ideas, that is not his view or expectation. Substantially, though not formally, his work is apologetic of the society in the latter days of its first existence, and is intended so to be, but without taking the shape of controversy, which almost always leads to a certain amount, however small, of recrimination and bitterness, not quite

compatible with a satisfactory investigation of truth. The painful impression created by the "History of the Pontificate of Clement XIV.," when it first appeared, was very general, and was of course shared by the Jesuits, who were most concerned. It arose, as far at least as we have had an opportunity of judging, not so much from anything actually written by Fr. Theiner, as from the suggestion to be collected, without much difficulty, from his manner, that he left something unwritten. There was allusion to documents missing, or mislaid, or mutilated, how, or by whom, not known, that might be made to tell a tale; it seemed to be insinuated, however unintentionally, that there had been something like a struggle between the author's charity and his candour, in dealing with the Jesuits; and the general effect of the entire was that certain matters were touched upon by Fr. Theiner in the prosecution of a painful duty, and that it might thus be inferred there were reasons for the dissolution of the society, other than the hostility it had provoked from the enemies of all society, or the enemies of the Church in particular. The Order, too, appeared to be made responsible, not only for its own acts or defaults, but for every indiscretion of its friends, and the Jesuits, who adhered to their institute in Russia, after the dissolution of the society, although they did so under pressure from the civil power, and, as was believed even at the time, with the sanction of the Pope, are treated, to say the least of it, severely in Fr. Theiner's History, and in such a way again, as to make the order, though extinct, accountable for the errors of a fraction of its members, supposing them to have erred, while no account is made of the unquestioning submission of the great majority, though it was very conspicuous and under great temptation. It could not exactly be said that facts were misstated or distorted by the distinguished narrator, but there was a certain disposition of light and shade, of costume, of drapery, of accessories generally, that quite changed the aspect and effect of the entire, and produced, we are completely willing to hope and believe, an incorrect impression of the spirit in which the work was designed and carried out. This, or something nearly resembling it, was the view taken of the publication by Father Rothaan, the late general of the society, as we learn from Fr. de Ravignan, and it was in obedience to a suggestion from his superior, that the

latter undertook the work before us. His view of the transactions preceding, and bringing about the dissolution of the society from the time that Pombal opened the campaign in Portugal to the publication of the Brief "*Dominus ac Redemptor*," is, we have already mentioned, nearly identical with the view put forward by ourselves, but which we are far from claiming as our own, and which the author has of course contracted to the space and period of Jesuit history with which it is conversant. His main object is to show that the dissolution of the society of Jesus was brought about by no vice of its organization, by no error doctrinal or moral in its teaching, by no relaxation, corruption, or lesser occasion for reform, but by the combined effort, and at that unhappy period, culminating power of its natural and immitigable enemies, from whom it never asked quarter or received any, the Jansenists and sophists of the eighteenth century. This he shows by circumstantial and documentary evidence that cannot well be stronger, and proves from the most hostile sources that the kings and ministers, who confederated to destroy the society, had no real cause of complaint against it, that some of them up to the last moment were even what might be called well affected to the order, that even the parliaments were not all equally determined in their enmity, but that kings, ministers and parliaments were in most cases the blind and unconscious agents of the Jansenist and infidel combination which was the governing and directing, though, not ostensible leader of the movement, as it was the sole gainer by the catastrophe. The Père de Ravignan will probably explain his object and plan most satisfactorily in his own words.

"It is not, however, the biography of these two popes I purpose to write, nor is it again the complete history of the two pontificates. The weary controversy on the Jesuits had, at the time in question, the sad privilege of occupying too large a space, and absorbing too constantly the attention of both Pontiffs to occasion any surprise, when we find here the detail of the acts of Clement XIII. and Clement XIV., brought out anew in relation to one particular order of facts and ideas. My object, say rather my duty, is to reproduce as faithfully as possible, the pontifical acts relative to the suppression of the Society of Jesus, in their entirety and according to their spirit.

"The Jesuit question, by some unhappy necessity, seems to have governed the thoughts and guided the pens of many historians.

They have been obliged, perhaps in opposition to their wishes, when dealing with these two Popes, to confine the application of their thoughts, and the course of their narrative, to the one sphere of action, embracing the operations of the enemies of the Society of Jesus, and the laborious opposition of the Holy See. The late work of Fr. Theiner, on the Pontificate of Clement XIV., might serve at need as an example of the force of circumstances, which narrows the history of a man, or of an epoch, to a single fact, a single question, as the one focus of interest.

“I must bow to the same necessity. It is not my design to encounter views which differ from my own, or to exhibit Clement XIII. and Clement XIV. in opposition to each other. My object is, to set out the historical truth of matters in simplicity and good faith, restoring to it when requisite, its absolute integrity, as I have been enabled to collect it from the most indisputable facts and documents.

“Mine is the legitimate ambition to be heard, as a witness, in my turn, after a renewed and conscientious study of the documents bequeathed to criticism by the suppression of the Society of Jesus. I should think I have some right to this. It is, however, to the history of the Pontifical acts that I shall apply myself, with the devotedness and submission to which they are entitled.


“Will a faithful and calm detail of the facts and acts of so disturbed an epoch throw a new light upon the Pontifical annals belonging to it? Will it communicate to them a more decided character of certainty? I should hope so, and it is my prayer to the Author of all truth and all justice.

“I act in obedience (and it is a consoling thought) to the suggestion of one who is no more. Our Reverend Father Rothaan, of pious memory, the late General of the Society of Jesus, had been in correspondence with me shortly before he was attacked by the cruel disease which carried him away from us. The work of Father Theiner (why should I not say so?) had deeply affected him. He there saw, not only the Society of Jesus attacked, but the Holy See, and Clement XIV. ill defended, and even compromised. He believed, as he wrote to me, that a better apology might be made for the Pontiff who had suppressed the Society, and in that view suggested to me some reflections which I have treasured up as the last bequest of my father. It was under the influence of this first inspiration I began my labours. They have one only object. I look to claim for them one only merit—Truth.”—*Pref. ii.-v.*

The opening chapter is taken up with a general description of the period when the enemies of the Society began to prevail, an eloquent and animated description we need hardly say, and one for which we are prepared by a short

reference to the Council of Trent, and the great Catholic reaction dating from that epoch. The Père de Ravignan modestly suppresses all mention of the part taken by the Society in the Catholic revival, and while dwelling on the conquests of the Church, and her recovery of so many provinces lost, invaded, or threatened, forbears to say that the Society was always the main, and in numerous cases the sole instrument of Providence, in the preservation or reconstitution of His kingdom upon earth. It was in any event about the time when the reaction to which all history bears evidence, and which all parties concur in ascribing to the Jesuits, would seem to have spent itself, that Jansenism and the modern philosophy combined their efforts to destroy those iron legionaries who alone stood firm and unrelaxed, whose organization, discipline, imposing numbers, cool intrepidity, or headlong daring, whose active intelligence and intelligent activity were a perpetual rallying point for the Church and authority, a perpetual obstacle to innovation and disorder. And how dislodge their columns, massed upon the social and religious heights of every land, Catholic, schismatic, heretic, or pagan? How break a line that had never wavered, but was strong in proportion to its extent, though the right wing rested upon the wall of China, and the left was pushed to the Marañon? How demoralize that dark phalanx, that never wore a decoration or coveted reward, that never trembled but for the perfection of its virtue, and dreaded corruption even in the gratitude of its friends? The attempt was simply hopeless, and the enemies of the Society were too sagacious, and understood their task too well, to confine themselves to vulgar persecution, or to be tied down by the common rules of action. They knew it was neither to be defeated nor bought, and therefore determined it should be disbanded. This could only be effected by the Pope, and accordingly all that intrigue, violence, intimidation, or persuasion could effect, was brought to bear upon the Holy See, by open enemies, or by the agents often unsuspecting whom they put in motion. The time was peculiarly favourable for such a project. The Portuguese throne was filled by a luxurious idiot, and the government in the hands of a cold and clever despot, inaccessible to fear, compassion, or remorse, of concentrated affections, for they rested on himself, of expansive malignity, for it took in half the world. Friendly—

to the sophistry of the age, not because it satisfied his understanding, but because it suited his temper, Pombal was necessarily the enemy of the Jesuits. Hating independence of any kind, he had the intolerance of conscience universal amongst tyrants, and belonged to that class of politicians even now in honour who would line the frontier of heaven with revenue police, and exclude divine grace unless protected by a permit. In him the philosophers had their first recruit and most valuable servant. In enterprise, in obstinacy, in ingenuity, he was more worth than all the kings and ministers of Europe together. Three great kingdoms, France, Spain, and Naples, with the small but important principality of Parma, were governed by princes of the house of Bourbon, whose family interests kept them in such close alliance, that with a little management their common action in this, as in other matters, might be relied upon. The morbid jealousy and unsleeping suspicion of Charles III. of Spain, laid him open to the designs of Pombal, and his inexorable character was sufficient guarantee for the trustworthiness of his enmity, once he should be gained. Louis XV., not deficient in intellect, nor depraved in will, not naturally hard-hearted or naturally unjust, was lapped in debauchery and petrified into selfishness, like the fair shoot imprisoned in stone by the waters that caress it. He had no dislike to the Jesuits, but the importunity of their enemies was troublesome; he admired justice but he loved repose; his kingdom he held in some esteem, but the laugh of an atheist, or the tear of a mistress, could always reckon on success. Naples and Parma were sure to follow in the wake of France and Spain, and what was most important, the ministers of the four countries were proselytes of the fashionable impiety. Among the Catholic powers, Sardinia, Austria for the time being, and what was left of Poland, favoured the Society. Russia and Prussia were, as the event showed, not unfriendly, and such, in a few words, were the materials with which the Jansenists, philosophers, and French magistracy endeavour to effect the dissolution of the Society, by intimidating, persuading, or coercing the Holy See, an enterprise in which they were successful for a time; until after accumulating ruin upon ruin the monarchy was devoured by democracy, the parliaments silenced by the guillotine, democracy in its turn absorbed by despotism, Jansenism died of inanition, and the sophists, or their suc-



cessors, were reserved by Providence to see humanity, religion, and the throne emerge from the general destruction, and to meet the Jesuits again in the same contest, restored, reorganized, bettered by experience, and in no dread of a second dissolution, though destined to many a reverse, and prepared for many a disaster. The contest which thus preceded the great though by no means complete or decisive triumph, (even for the moment,) of the enemies of Christianity, was carried on during the reigns of Clement XIII. and Clement XIV., and terminated, we might almost say, with the life of the latter Pontiff. The Père de Ravignan rightly considered that each pontificate is the necessarily complement of the other, and therefore has gone at considerable length into the history of Clement XIII. It is hardly necessary for us to say how successfully a subject of such acknowledged difficulty, and requiring such tender management, has been dealt with by one whose name raises expectation to the utmost, and who, by the common suffrage of all who have read his book, has certainly not failed to justify it in the present instance. We shall now extract a few pages for the description given by the author of the period we have just considered, and it will be perceived the passage in question supplies the entire argument and plan of the work.

“The Council of Trent was destined in the designs of God to exercise, and did in fact, exercise over all Christendom an influence whose results were incalculable. Giving expression to the belief, and the feelings of the Universal Church, it was the starting point, or rather the *primum mobile* of a wonderful movement, and of a powerful triumph of Catholic faith. Thenceforward Protestantism was arrested in its conquering progress. In the North it was forced back into a narrow space, and in its stead the Roman Church everywhere re-established her powerful empire undisturbed and perpetual. Upper and Lower Austria, Hungary, Bohemia, Poland, the Rhenish Provinces, part of the Low Countries, and France, had all been threatened, or even invaded, more or less, by the contagion of heresy. Truth resumed her place, and her victories first received a check at the treaty of Westphalia.

“In France, where, beyond any other country the religious congregations, old and new, vied in zeal for the work of Catholic regeneration, the onward movement of faith was perhaps more prolonged. Nevertheless, her ardour appeared to relax, and her progress to have reached its term, between the years 1656 and 1660, that memorable epoch when the development of Jansenism,

the publication of the Provinciales, was coincident with the death of St. Vincent de Paul.

“Great good, therefore, had been wrought; it was confirmed too, but without any increase of its area of operations in Europe. America, the Indies, the Annamite Empire and China, gave to the Church innumerable children, and consoled her for the recent defections. Amongst ourselves upon the old Catholic soil, and for about a century, from 1650 to 1750, it would be correct to say that the spirit of faith, the practice of Christian duties, and the love of the Church generally, kept their ground. But gradually they declined, and seemed to sink.

“Nevertheless, the struggle against the Church is not to cease. Like Jesus Christ, and with him the Church has been placed in the world as a *sign of contradiction* and of war: the *sign*—the occasion merely, never the *cause*.

“For a long time previously, Protestantism, as we have remarked, struck to the heart, and too grievously disabled to effect anything single handed, stood deprived of its former power of propagation and conquest, but a scarce perceptible underworking was busy at its reproduction under a new form. About this time (1750) there sprung, and disclosed themselves in health and vigour, two branches, the growth of that fatal root—*Jansenism*, a mitigated Calvinism, and *philosophism*, the last development of private judgment.

“Jansenism, too, had its private judgment like every heresy that deliberates and chooses without obeying. Repeated condemnations only served to irritate the spirit of pride and rebellion inherent in every obstinate sect. The authority of the Church personified in her head,—the Bishops in union with the Holy See,—generous defenders of the faith, and dutiful observants of the submission she requires, could never be otherwise than enemies in the eyes of Jansenism.

“In point of fact, the Pope and the Church, immoveable depositaries of revealed truth, do impose obedience upon all. There is the home of that living and resisting antagonism, that invincible obstacle that repels all innovators. All their efforts are, therefore, directed against the authority One, Holy, Catholic, and Roman, which condemns them. Jansenism devoted itself with ardour to this disastrous war, and it so happened towards the middle of the eighteenth century, that with this end in view, the men who defended the doctrines of Jansenius in the name of the Scriptures and divine traditions, met and confederated with the materialist and atheistic sophists, whose reign began amid the intellectual orgies and moral depravity of the period.

“It is not to be denied that the Jansenists and Philosophers differed in the substance and ultimate scope of their ideas and intentions; but they were both in presence of the ancient and imposing hierarchy of the Church, the opponent of their projects. The

authority that stands supreme and infallible in matters of faith, presented to them an insurmountable barrier: they knew it. The sectary and the free thinker were equally unwilling to acknowledge the master who teaches with the power of God himself, what we have to believe and what we have to do. The incredulous, or the rebellious dread, beyond all things, a superior who controls his understanding. To rebellious spirits such a command is hateful or absurd. 'Ecrasons l'infâme,' said the free thinkers; let us attack and disarm the spiritual authority, was the inevitable proposal of the sectaries condemned by it.

"They easily came to an understanding without express concert of measures, perhaps: the authority of the Holy See and of the bishops still stood erect,—it still spoke, it still reigned over belief; its influence and its action would work an indomitable and perpetual resistance. To destroy it utterly, to annihilate it at a single blow, the Catholic constitution and hierarchy was a task of difficulty. There were many whose desires stopped short of this, or who desired it but timidly—others, on the contrary, groaned for it with ardour, and laboured without intermission. Did they at that early period confidently rely upon success? One thing is certain, their imaginations were inflamed by passion, and they ventured on the most daring enterprises.

"One object was common to them all, and served as a rallying point. They were to subjugate the Church, to ruin her independence, and bow her to the yoke of the civil power. Potent auxiliaries were at hand. A large number of statesmen, magistrates, priests, and publicists, lent their zealous co-operation to the work of destruction, for the most part without renouncing the name of Christian. They regarded it as an axiom of politics, as the normal condition of society—that the Church should be subject to the law and will of the temporal power even in the exercise of spiritual functions and canonical rights.

"Jansenists, therefore, philosophers, statesmen, and magistrates, with or without previous concert, met upon this neutral ground. They combined their forces, and began a persecution equally disastrous, and memorable against the spouse of Jesus Christ.

"This is what I wish to establish here, and to have clearly understood, in order subsequently to set in its true aspect, the historical reality of all that regards the two Pontificates of Clement XIII. and Clement XIV., and the suppression of the Society of Jesus.

"What, then, were these Jesuits, in relation to the different classes of adversaries I have just enumerated? How did the Society of Jesus interfere with certain statesmen, philosophers, Jansenists, magistrates, and jurisconsults, imbued with parliamentary maxims?

"Here I am quite aware it does not become me to answer. My testimony might be impeached as partial. I shall appeal to the historians who have least in common with the Jesuits,—to the Pro-

testants. They confirm in every respect the view just presented of the pastors hostile to the Church towards the middle of the eighteenth century.”—pp. 1—7.

Agreeably to his plan, the author proceeds to quote from authors hostile, or indifferent, at least, who all concur in ascribing the dissolution of the society to the joint action of the Jansenists and Philosophers. Ranke, Schœll, D’Alembert, Voltaire, Frederick II., De Priest, Fleury, and numerous others, from whom the Père de Ravignan makes pretty copious extracts, place this point, at least, beyond cavil; and it is a striking circumstance, that in no portion of the private correspondence of the enemies of Jesuits, is there the slightest stress laid upon the gravamina of the public charges. Under ordinary circumstances, if men were engaged in exterminating from the republic the teachers of corrupt morality, conspirators against the public peace, advocates and apostles of regicide, it is hardly credible that their private letters referring exclusively to these criminals, should never once advert to their imputed guilt, to the dangerous state of public morals under their guidance, to the perils that beset the throne from their turbulence and disloyalty, to the detection of any of their numerous conspiracies, but seem to have been written in an interest quite apart from that of morality or good government; never at any time putting forward a more dignified motive than the amour-propre of those who were engaged in the work, and had allowed themselves no retreat; sometimes alleging the true motive of most of the writers; that is, the entire subversion of religion, and frequently making not the slightest mention of reason or motive, but simply discussing the means. The friends of religion, a term at that period convertible with the friends of the Jesuits, understood the conflict in the same way, and gave their opinion accordingly, without the least disguise. Saint Alphonsus Liguori, not to mention any other, else we might include the universal prelacy of the Church, pronounced his unhesitating judgment to the same effect; and in our own times Fr. Theiner himself affirms, that the great obstacle in the way of the designs of Jansenist and Infidel, “was the Society of Jesus, by reason of its zeal for religion, its influence over the mind of youth, the high estimation in which it was held by princes, and its invincible respect for the

chair of Peter." Voltaire understood this quite well, and consequently bent the full weight of his attack upon the Jesuits, whom he regarded as the mainstay of Christianity. The Anti-Jesuit movement had been in progress from the time of Clement XI., and constantly grew to more threatening proportions during the pontificate of Clement XII. and Benedict XIV., until we reach the evil days of Clement XIII., on whom and his successor the storm beat fastest and most piteously; although history, or, we should rather say, the prevalent mistake upon the subject, has connected the name of the latter almost exclusively with the immediate events which led to the suppression of the society.


The character of Clement XIII., as described by the Père de Ravignan, and as disclosed without description by the circumstances of his pontificate, is not precisely what would entitle him to be called great, or to speak more accurately, conspicuous, in the ordinary sense of the word. His conduct and character might, however, be said to be rigorously those of a Pope. Not recognising in himself, or, possibly in his counsellors, that skill in government and cleverness in negotiation which has been remarkable in many of his predecessors; instead of allowing himself to be kept in suspense by every difficulty until time pressed, and a rash decision, according to the invariable precedent in such cases, was forced upon him; he made his decision speedily but without precipitation. He did not form his words or actions according to the nice rules of prudence or expediency, but substituted conscience for talent and truth for diplomacy. He was the friend of the Jesuits not from impulse, or instinct, or relations of intimacy, but simply because he connected them with the interest of the Church. He resolved never to sanction or connive at anything to their prejudice, but he was equally determined not to resort to any species of intrigue, or even to any innocent device of human prudence in their defence. He has been wrongly represented as Pontiff of the Middle Ages, astray and agape in the nineteenth century. A Pontiff of the Middle Ages would have dealt very differently with the haughtiest king of them all. Yet he was by no means a Fabius; he neither sought to restore the fortunes of the society by temporising and delay, nor probably would have succeeded if he did. He never was turned out of his path by the terrors or seductions of kingly influence, and still less by the inso-

lence or violence of power. He never showed less favour to the Jesuits or maintained their defence with less decided countenance at one period of his pontificate than at another. He argued with princes and ministers: the humility of a suppliant, or the dignity of exhortation were equally familiar to him, but he was as far from yielding as from threatening, and though he exercised his prerogative when necessary, it was plainly not for the prerogative's sake. He was "instant in season, out of season, reproof, entreating, rebuking, in all patience and doctrine," but entirely neglectful of merely human measures for the furtherance of his projects; for his own defence or that of his friends.

It was not from a Pope of this character that much could be expected by the Anti-Jesuit league. Moreover, the Duc de Choiseul, the principal conspirator after Pombal, did not hunger for the destruction of the society with the same vehemence as the Portuguese or the Spaniard. He was equally determined as either, but not so rancorous. He was willing to apply any pressure, but the absence of all conviction or strong feeling of any kind made him dislike a crisis. He was the type of the French noble of the period, believing in nothing but his own fortunes, and sacrificing to them alone. Hence he was willing to wait for a more favourable turn of affairs, and adjourn the prosecution of the grand scheme of destruction to the next pontificate, which he felt sure was at hand; filling up the interval with details of persecution and spoliation sufficient to amuse the enforced leisure of himself and his confederates, until they should have an opportunity of resuming operations with an assurance of success. By somewhat of patience, too, he considered the hostility of Austria to their design might be mitigated, neutralized, or, perhaps, as the event proved, changed into co-operation, and it was, moreover, the duty of any far-seeing statesman, not to leave the chapter of accidents entirely out of account, but trusting mainly to himself to rely a little upon circumstances. In Austria, for instance, although the piety and firmness of the empress were of themselves insuperable obstacles, yet the empress was not immortal, and who could answer for her successor. The Jansenist interest was powerful, though secret at Vienna. Febronianism was at work to revive the old and disastrous boundary feuds between the Pope and the empire. Austria, the hereditary enemy of France, was

now in cordial amity with her. In other struggles the Holy See might rely upon some one of the Catholic princes to espouse her cause, through policy or piety; but now the Pope stood alone. He did not bend, to be sure, nor could he well be broken, but means might be taken to secure a successor who would conform to the wishes of the princes, and make their triumph all the more effectual for being the less violent and noisy. Schism was after all a dangerous, and, perhaps not altogether possible alternative. The prelacy of every country was known to be all but unanimous in favour of the Jesuits, and although it was reserved for the French episcopate in the next reign to give the world a lesson of heroism such as compelled the admiration of even so determined a Protestant as Walter Scott; yet it was felt by Choiseul and his companions, that safer and more effectual means than an attempt at schism would not be wanting in the course of time.

The Père de Ravignan, however, must not be understood to sketch the history of Clement XIII. in this off-hand way. On the contrary, he goes through it in great detail, and, space permitting, we should be very glad to follow him. Portugal, France, and Spain, have each a chapter devoted to their several relations with the Holy See upon this matter. The occurrences of this melancholy period are familiar to most readers, not merely of ecclesiastical but of general history. The comical enormities charged upon the Society by Pombal, in the opening of the campaign, amongst which figured the establishment of an independent republic in America, and an invasion of Portugal by the English, were amongst the least incredible of the fables with which the Portuguese press flooded the Peninsula, and though at first burned by the hangman in Spain and France, they came to be accredited as soon as these countries were added to the coalition. The tyranny of Pombal, equal to that of Robespierre in jealousy, cruelty, and universality, surpassing it in strength and duration, is faithfully and dispassionately recorded by our historian. It is, we imagine, quite superfluous for us to give even an abstract of the horrors perpetrated in the name of religion, morality, and good government during the administration of Pombal, as recorded by the Père de Ravignan. There is no one, or, at least, there are very few who would not be touched at the sufferings of the Jesuits, without process of law, with-



out distinction of rank, age, or infirmity, in the dungeons of Lisbon, or the hulks, into which the unconvicted convicts were stowed like swine, to be discharged upon the Roman shores, to the disgust of Spain and France, both of whom were on the eve of imitating, and the former of surpassing the same atrocities. We shall not dwell upon the diplomatic rupture between Portugal and the Holy See, nor upon the way in which France was drawn into the confederacy. The old parliamentary animosities inflamed by the spirit of Jansenism, whose most active propagators, lay and clerical, were in some way or other recruited from the magistracy, the prevalence of scepticism and immorality in the court and literature, which nursed the philosophic doctrines of the eighteenth century, the enmity of Pompadour, and the selfish levity of Choiseul, were sufficient to account for the comparative facility with which France was associated to Pombal and his fellow-labourers. But the adhesion of France though so fatal was glorious to the Society, for the French prelacy, then as now the most eminent in the universal Church, collectively and individually bore testimony to the innocence of the Society, and upheld its rights not by secret or subaltern expedients, but by a direct appeal to the throne, remarkable for that freedom of language, and courageous invocation of common right and common law and public opinion, which has seldom wanted an echo in France under any form of government, and which no power, however solidly established in France, can long afford to neglect. It required some boldness to say in the country which had passed from Richelieu and Mazarin to Louis XIV., "*Ce qui m'épouvante dans cette forme de proceder c'est qu'elle ne respire que l'arbitraire qui est le plus terrible des fléaux de l'humanité.*" Yet such was the language of the Bishop of Grenoble to the Chancellor of France.

The Père de Ravignan follows Louis XV. through all his waverings, and Clement XIII. throughout his uniform course of entreaty, remonstrance, advice, argument, appeals of every sort, and to all the powers, secular and spiritual, engaged in the question of the Jesuits. His briefs of thanks and encouragement to the bishops who had espoused and clung to the cause of religion and the Jesuits, would form a bulky volume, and are in strong and happy contrast to the fewness of those it was his duty to direct to such of the hierarchy as were remiss or ill-

affected. In France, however, unlike Spain, Portugal, and Naples, where no forms of law were observed, the jealousy of public opinion and of the parliaments themselves had to be respected. Hence the proceedings were less summary, less cruel, less brutal than in other countries, but more harassing, more vexatious, more wearisome to the soul, and more trying to the conscience. The agony was prolonged by the external justice, the whole substance of which had been eaten out by the passions of that miserable time. The persecution here took the form of oaths and tests, the most abominable expedient, as we well know, ever invented by tyranny to torture conscience, to debauch virtue, and foster hypocrisy. Some few in the anguish of the extremity, as in the case of the Pere de la Croix, yielded not so much to temptation as to a mistaken sense of duty, but soon discovered their error and atoned for it. The vast majority went into exile without murmur or remonstrance. The parliaments one after the other decreed the suppression of the Society, and the decree was rigorously carried into effect, although the Pope, with that meek but invincible courage which was so decided a feature of his character, annulled the decrees in question, and protested against their execution. We have a sample in the following pages of the way in which that execution was accomplished.

“Clement XIII. had already, as we have seen, condemned and annulled, by a decree pronounced in the allocution of September 3, 1762, the sentences of the French parliaments against the Jesuits. Prudential reasons had prevented him from clothing with the character of official publicity this act of pontifical power. He had at the same time employed all the resources of his zeal, and exhausted every expedient of conciliation and tenderness in dealing with the feeble Louis XV. That wretched prince, between his mistress and his minister, was unequal to any generous exercise of the will, to any firm or conscientious decision. He will go on yielding to the end.

“Disregarding the remonstrance of the Pope, as might have been expected, the parliaments, in the beginning of the year 1764, levelled a new sentence of proscription against the Jesuits. In virtue of this sentence the fathers were obliged to abjure the institute, and confirm upon oath the odious imputations with which the former sentences had loaded them. On their refusal they were to be expelled from France, and deprived of the slender pension of 400*fr.*, which had been assigned to them. All, with very few exceptions, rejected the outrageous oath; they unhesitatingly pre-

ferred exile to the advantages they should have been obliged to purchase at the peril of their consciences.

“The proscription was executed with the utmost rigour. Neither age, nor infirmity, nor talent, nor virtue, nor services gave any title to exemption. All were included in the anathema. They were sent to beg their bread in foreign countries,* and Louis XV. had the inconceivable weakness to permit the violence of the parliament to tear from the children of France the sons of the Dauphin, the pious and learned Father Berthier, whom he had placed over them. The seal of the royal sanction, however, was yet wanting to these indignities. ‘Choiseul and Mdme. de Pompadour,’ says Schœll, ‘irreconcilable in their hatred, and intoxicated by the incense of the philosophers, tormented Louis XV. so long that at length, through mere lassitude, he yielded to their importunity, and issued, in the month of Nov., 1764, an edict, styled irrevocable, suppressing the order of the Jesuits throughout the kingdom of France.’

“The 3rd of December following, the Duc de Praslin, minister of foreign affairs, sent the edict of suppression to the Marquis d’Aubeterre, French ambassador at Rome. In this ministerial despatch, given in extenso by the author of the Pontificate of Clement XIV., we read the following passages. ‘It is with regret, and after having long and maturely weighed everything, that the king has at length settled upon the course just adopted. Although his majesty was convinced that the stability of religion in France did not depend upon the preservation of the order of Jesuits, inasmuch as the Catholic and Roman faith had there been happily maintained for eleven hundred years before the establishment of that religious Society; nevertheless, *the king considered the order useful to Church and state*, whether in respect of edification or of instruction; but reasons of a higher nature, grounded upon the public tranquillity, have induced his majesty to explain his intentions in the manner you have just seen.† Under these circum-

* We have still in existence the farewell letter written by the Pere de Brauvais, to one of his friends, on his way to exile. “It is the kingdom, my dear friend, that I must leave. I have spent thirty-six years in forming citizens, and I must no longer be a citizen myself. At seventy years of age I must look out for a resting-place, and close in foreign lands a life forty-two years of which has been devoted to my country’s service. In presence of the inexorable alternative between exile and an oath I must not take, I do not hesitate, but I go a victim to the fidelity I owe the sacred engagements I have contracted. Full of respect for the hand that smites, submissive to the hand that permits, I only implore the aid of that which supports.”

† It is a curious thing to hear Louis XV. himself give his opinion

stances, Sir, it would be very useless, and even more dangerous still, for the Pope to take any step directly or indirectly contrary to the wishes of the king, and his Holiness out of zeal for religion, and even out of kindness for the Jesuits, *ought to impose upon himself the same silence the king has prescribed in his own states.*''—pp. 153-7.

The conduct of Clement XIII., in regard to Spain, was uniform with his treatment of Louis XV. The intrigues by which Charles III. was wrought upon to conceive so implacable an hostility to the Jesuits have never come to light. The account by the Spanish Jesuit Caseda, of a conversation between the ex-provincial of the Jesuits, after their expulsion from Spain, and a grandee of that country, is well known, and not wanting in probability. A forged letter, with the Roman post mark, purporting to come from the general to the provincial, reflecting on the legitimacy of the king, and commanding the Spanish superior to prepare the minds of his religious for a revolu-

of the edict of proscription which mistress and minister had extorted from his weakness against the religious of the Society of Jesus. In an autograph letter of this prince, addressed to the Duc de Choiseul, and which M. de St. Priest has had the ingenious idea of publishing in his appendix to the History of the Jesuits, page 298, we read—

“Altogether I find the preamble much too long and too circumstantial; as to all the doings of the parliaments, I shall simply say, that the Society having caused a great ferment in my kingdom, I order all its individuals to depart the same, and that I shall give a pension for life to each in whatever country he may fix upon.

“Art. III. I dont think we need speak of *punishment*, that is a good deal too strong.

“Art. VIII. The expulsion is here too decidedly characterized as *perpetual and irrevocable*. Dont we know that the most stringent edicts have been rescinded in spite of every possible proviso?

“*I have no cordial affection for the Jesuits, but every heresy has at all times detested them—in that lies their strength. I say no more on that subject. If I send them away against my own inclination, for the peace of my kingdom, I dont, at all events, wish to have it believed that I adhere to all the parliaments have said and done against them.*

“I persist in my opinion that their expulsion should be accompanied by the reversal of all that has been done against them by the parliaments. (Just what Clement XIII. had the spirit to do.)

“Yielding, as I do, to the opinion of others for the tranquillity of my kingdom, the changes I insist on must be made, otherwise I shall not act. *I am silent, for I should say too much.*”

tion that would place the crown on the head of the rightful heir, was an expedient worthy the ingenuity of Pombal: but whatever were the reasons determining the king, he at once became the most irreconcilable enemy to the Society. Burying the secret of their guilt, as he said, in his royal breast, forbidding the discussion of the subject to any of his subjects under pain of death, he decreed that memorable expulsion of the Jesuits, with the details of which we are so familiar, which exceeds in atrocity all that reading or imagination pictures to us of the Black Hole of Calcutta, or the middle passage in a slaver, and stands out the most terrible record of unlimited power and its unlimited abuse. But that was not the principal point secured to the confederates by the enlistment of Charles III. His unrelenting temper, the stern tenacity of his hatred, the invincible obstinacy of his will, were to them the strongest guarantee they could have for the accomplishment of their design. Clement, however, had shown that there was nothing to be expected from him; that no threat, no seduction, no violence, could be of the slightest avail. The county of Avignon, and the Duchy of Beneventum were invaded and occupied, without moving him a hair's breadth from his purpose. Their restoration was promised as the reward of his compliance with the wishes of the princes; but he made as little account of the promised reparation as of the perpetrated wrong, and totally disregarding every suggestion of merely human prudence, and putting out of sight every dictate of human interest, he adhered in sadness, but without hesitation, or doubt, or despondency, to the strict letter of his duty, as he understood it. And when at length his sorrows reached their term, and he was relieved from the cross which had galled him so sorely and so unintermittingly during his pontificate, he left the Society of Jesus in the same canonical position as he had found it, without the diminution of a single privilege, and without having withdrawn, or seemed to withdraw, his countenance for a single hour.

The conclave which terminated in the elevation of Cardinal Ganganelli, under the name of Clement XIV., to the Chair of Peter, was in many respects the most remarkable of modern times. Portugal and the Bourbon princes were determined to have a Pope after their own fashion, and it was plainly intimated to the Conclave that no Pope not pledged formally or substantially to the dissolution

of the Jesuits should be recognized by the four crowns. The friends of the Jesuits were the more numerous and active party in the sacred college, where the Jesuits had few, if any, real antagonists, unless perhaps the foreign cardinals, who were the deputies of their respective governments. Spain was more particularly threatening and urgent for an express undertaking in writing, on the part of the Pope elect, to suppress the Order of the Jesuits, as a condition precedent to the consummation and recognition of the election. But the French Cardinal Bernis, though committed to the views of his government, and prepared to forward them in every legitimate way, peremptorily refused to interfere with election in so uncanonical a manner; declared that, if it were pressed upon the conclave, the sacred college would be obliged to dissolve with a protest against violence and obsession; and with a sentiment of his duty as a bishop and a cardinal, that cannot be too much commended in the representative of such a court, and such a cause, at such a time; refused to concur in any measure that would render the election simoniacal. It is, therefore, with great pain, in late years especially, the Jesuits have seen the validity of that election impeached, or at least called in question by some who love the Society "too well" perhaps, but certainly "not wisely." The temerity of M. Crétineau Joly, in particular, has been regretted and censured by none more severely than by the Jesuits; and this is not a feeling gotten up at a moment's warning, but a sentiment testified uninterruptedly from the dissolution of the Society to its restoration, and from thence till now. Perhaps the choice of the Sacred College was the only one possible. Cardinal Ganganelli was originally amongst those who seemed to have fewest claims, both from his juniority and his leaning, not so much to the crowns, as to the idea that the question of dissolving the Society was one not of abstract justice, but of expediency. On the other hand, he was not sufficiently the enemy of the Society to satisfy the expectations of the princes who required a categorical engagement on the part of the Pope elect, not only to abolish the Order of the Jesuits, but to comply with their desires on four other points. His antecedents, though not of a violent or marked character, would seem to pledge him to the suppression, or at least radical alteration of the Society, while at the same time, his well known piety and

moderation were a guarantee that, should the suppression of the Society be inevitable, it would be effected, as the event proved, in the way least hurtful to religion, and the reputation of the Society itself. The best proof of the canonicity of the election, next to the letters of the Cardinal de Bernis, is the fact that the most vehement opponents of Cardinal Ganganelli finally came round to his party; taking into account most probably his eminent virtues, his acceptance by the princes, the fact that, being himself the only religious in the sacred college, he would have a natural sympathy for the Jesuits, and relying also on the sense of his awful responsibility as Pope, which would outweigh every other consideration, and every engagement contrary to its dictates. Be that as it may, Pope he was elected, and Pope he was *de facto* and *de jure*, as no Jesuit or well judging friend of the Society ever thought of denying, and as the Père de Ravignan affirms, with utmost positiveness.

The ceremonies of the consecration, however, were scarce ended, when the agony of the new Pontiff, more grievous and more deserving by far of compassion than that of his predecessor, began. Clement XIII. saw the evils that were thickening upon the Church, but as far as he was personally concerned, he was saved the anguish of suspense and indecision. His mind was made up—there was simplicity in his suffering—he had determined on resistance, whereas his successor's conscience was not thoroughly informed on the course to be adopted. Fully *resolved* to do what was for the peace of the Church, but not fully *knowing* what that might be; not having the choice between good and evil, but between two evils of prodigious magnitude; anxious to avert both if possible, and yet overwhelmed by the conviction that he should elect for one; always overhung by a cloud of despair, and always straining for a glimpse of hope; encompassed and straitened by the princes from without; rent like Jerusalem in her last hour by the conflict of doubts within; ever craving a respite from the final decision, and finding none; the unhappy Pontiff proclaimed more eloquently than by any words, that, in dissolving the Society, he yielded to violence and necessity; that, were there occasion for reform or suppression, he needed not the prompting, still less the constraint of kings; but that God,

having narrowed his discretion, like David's, to the choice of calamity, he had only to choose like David, and submit like him.

The stereotyped forms of congratulation were altered by the ambassadors of the Bourbon princes, to make him feel that he was Pope by their grace as well as by the grace of God ; to urge their demands, and to intimate that they considered him pledged to gratify their wishes. From that moment despatch followed despatch, each more urgent than the other—each more insulting—each more threatening. The Pope, whose resolution had only reached the point of determining to suppress the Society, if the suppression was unavoidable, conceived himself free in conscience to promise the extinction of the Society in the fulness of time, much as the general of a besieged place undertakes to surrender if succours fail to come within a stated period. He ratified by a brief the statu quo in the dominions of the House of Bourbon, by which a canonical sanction was given to the sequestration of the property of the Jesuits; he expressly undertook, in a letter to the king of Spain, to abolish the Society, and was afterwards reduced to the plea of time, in order that the canonical forms might be observed. He would gladly have remitted the question to a General Council, but the chalice could not pass away from him, and every concession to the crowns only rendered them more peremptory and more exacting. To judge by what we learn from certain writers, Professor Leu amongst the number, the Pope was as eager for the suppression of the Society, as Charles III.; the ministers of the Bourbon princes, were so many lambs, whose bleatings wrung the heart of the pastor; and the Jesuits were so many wolves, or rather so many foxes, ready to fasten upon the lambs when occasion served, and by their superhuman cleverness, more than a match for kings, pope, ministers, and ambassadors put together. We are very far from including Father Theiner among the writers who have taken, or we should rather say, who have given this view, for it is impossible to find simplicity so refreshing as this would indicate in any one who has reached the years of discretion. The learning of that distinguished man is too solid, and his motives too unimpeachable to admit of his giving such a colour, at least intentionally, to his narrative; but it is a fact, nevertheless, that the thing has

been attempted, and as might be expected where the Jesuits are concerned, not without a degree of success. Under such circumstances there is nothing like “producing the record,” (to use a term of art); an appeal to facts is a great deal, but facts have sometimes two sides; whereas a document, but more especially a non-official and confidential document, has seldom more than one reading, and Fr. Ravignan quotes the private correspondence between the Cardinal de Bernis and the Duc de Choiseul, which will show in what respect the princes held the Holy See, and how forbearingly they were disposed to act towards it.

“The Duc de Choiseul accompanied this official despatch with a confidential letter addressed to the Cardinal de Bernis. We there read, amongst other startling things, ‘I should not be astonished if the Pope, who dearly loves his monkery, embarrassed, too, by circumstances, and haunted by his pusillanimous fear of poison, should have gotten up a quiet little negociation with the king of Spain’s confessor monk, to whom it would not surprise him if he allowed a glimpse of the calotte rouge. Be that as it may, we shall baffle by our urgency the intrigues of the *fratacci*. We shall meet the Pope’s motives with motives of fear—we shall annihilate those little Roman tactics, and we shall know what we have to expect from the feelings of the Holy Father, whom I greatly mistrust. It is very difficult for a monk not to remain a monk, and still more difficult for an Italian monk to be frank and honest in his dealings.’

“Such was the respect, such the consideration testified by the prime minister of the most Christian king for the supreme head of the Church. What must not have been already the anguish of the Pontiff’s mind?

“But we can have a still clearer insight into the spirit which animated Choiseul. We have a better sample still of the levity and inconsistency with which he regulated affairs of such grave importance for the interest of religion and of Catholic states. On the 26th of August he wrote to the French ambassador at Rome, and after having explained to him that the instructions in the previous dispatches were merely comminatory, he added, ‘I shall wind up the history of the Jesuits by placing before your eyes a picture that I think you will consider striking. *I do not know if it has been well done to expel the Jesuits from France and Spain.* They are now expelled from all the states of the house of Bourbon. And those monks once expelled, I think it was a still greater blunder to make an ostentatious move at Rome for the suppression of the order, and to give Europe notice of the move. The thing is done, however. It so happens the kings of France, Spain, and Naples,

are at open war with the Jesuits and their partisans. Are they to be suppressed or are they not? Will the kings succeed or will the Jesuits carry the day? This is the question that agitates cabinets; it is the well-spring of the intrigues, vexations, and embarrassments that beset all the Catholic courts. Truly you cannot take a quiet look at the picture without seeing the caricature. If I were ambassador at Rome I should be ashamed to think that Father Ricci was my master's antagonist.'

"Bernis replied in much the same strain. 'I have no *arrière pensée* regarding the Jesuits. Like yourself, M. le Duc, I do not inquire whether it has been well or ill done to expel the Jesuits from the four kingdoms, or whether, after their expulsion, it has been wise to solicit their extinction all over the world. I start from the state of things we have to deal with *now*. The kings of France and Spain must win the day against the general of the Jesuits. It is the Pope alone who can give them the victory, and it is our part to induce him to do so. He is a bishop—he must follow the canonical forms—he must keep on terms with the clergy, and consult his own reputation. He is a temporal prince, and has many obligations to the courts of Vienna and Turin, as well as towards Poland—all this requires time.'

"There are cruel caprices in politics—their most powerful influences are sometimes very little and very hollow. A question of compromised vanity determines the issue of serious, and afflicting enterprises on the part of men to whom Providence has entrusted the government of nations, and men will probably disavow with contempt what officially they maintain with haughty obstinacy. Accordingly M. de St. Priest has not been able to avoid saying, 'Thus with inconceivable levity did Choiseul condemn the very measure of which he was the author.' It will be readily admitted that with persecutors of this character the portion of the victims involved more than one variety of suffering. But it is not my part to give expression to them. I shall only ask leave to say that I prefer the earnestness of the courts of Spain and Naples in their struggle against the Society of Jesus. There, at least, the ruin of these poor religious was followed up with the frankness and firmness of a declared hatred. In France, moreover, sheltered behind the levity of Choiseul, there lived and moved, we well know, enmities quite as sincere, quite as deep-rooted as elsewhere.'"—pp. 280-3.


The same levity and the same absence of real cause for the hostility to the society is brought home to the doors of its most active enemies the parliaments. In the first place, as we showed in the paper to which we have already alluded, the parliaments were by no means unanimous in their decrees against the society, and, if the votes for acquittal be weighed against those for condemnation, it

will be found, that on the whole the Jesuits were proscribed in many parliaments by a majority of only one, in some of two or three, and on the whole by a majority so narrow, as to be accounted for partly by chance and partly by management. But the Père de Ravignan quotes, perhaps, the most striking instance of the way in which these things were managed, and of the spirit which animated some, at least, of those who had to decide upon questions which were convulsing all Europe. "No one here," writes a zealous parliamentarian from Dijon, "bears the Jesuits ill-will, but we don't want to be better than our neighbours; and will not have any patch-work, '*Nous ne ferons pas de bigarrure.*'" It was on the same principle, perhaps, that the revolutionary tribunals dealt out such impartial justice to the magistracy, and chopped off their heads by dozens, most probably "pour ne pas faire de bigarrure."

The final step was at length taken to force a decision on the Pope. The decencies of diplomacy had been too long regarded; like the forms of our own legislature in certain cases, they afforded a shelter and a retreat to the Pope, that it was essential to cut off. France, however, was not sufficiently far gone in revolutionary ruffianism, nor indeed was her hatred of the Jesuits sufficiently intense to admit of her playing the bully "pur et simple." It was foreign to her character, to her manners, to her feelings. But Spain had a man for the purpose, though it would be a libel upon Spain to say that he represented the national character, or that she had another in her wide dominions to paragon Monino. Stern of aspect, coarse in mind, dull in sensibility, hard of heart, inflexible in purpose, brutal in demeanour, the terrors of his brow controlled the disgust that was created by his swagger. You would have said his blood had flown not so much through scoundrels as through hang-men since the flood. The fanaticism of his hatred, and the doggedness of its pursuit were so well known that his bare nomination filled the Pope with terror. Clement felt that all was consummated, and could not for some days induce himself to grant the new ambassador an audience. That once done, however, the catastrophe soon followed. The Pope began to prepare the fatal instrument that was to disband and scatter his faithful army, and its progress was too rapid for his wishes. Meanwhile, to appease for a time the eagerness of his persecutors, and to give them tangible proof that he had their work in

hand, the consequences of the brief were anticipated by withdrawing the Roman and other colleges from the care of the society, by closing the noviciates, sealing up the archives, and sequestering the property of the houses. Last of all, on the 16th of August, 1773, the triumph of the powers of this world was complete; the brief, "*Dominus ac Redemptor* issued," and the Society of Jesus was no more. The general, his assistants, and the rectors of the more important colleges were conveyed to prison to go through the forms of a judicial process. Placed beside the awful magnitude and consequences of the act that abolished the Society of Jesus, its episodes and collateral issues vanish and are lost. After the victory was won it appeared incredible to the victors themselves that the Pope should have yielded under any pressure, and in the presumption of their pride and exultation they believed the Church would speedily follow the society; fools that they were, the existence of the Church is linked to that of her Founder only: and the society itself, a very fraction of the Church, which it had cost them so much toil, so many watchings, such delicate intrigue, such bold impiety, such a waste of power intellectual and physical to destroy; was destined in the course of a few years to be revived and fill the world with its name, its spirit, and its works.

Whether simply overruled by a disposition of Providence, or acting in conformity with his own peculiar views, the Pontiff suffered the publication of the brief to be accompanied by none of the formalities commonly supposed essential. He carefully abstained from saying anything that might be wrested to imply a condemnation of the religious in their doctrines or practice. The general that was so soon to languish and die in the prisons of the state, could not have been more tender of the reputation of the Society. The peace of the Church, and the importunity of the princes, was put forward as the sole reason of the measure, and to our view, that remarkable brief was unmistakeably intended by Providence, and we have no doubt, intended by its author to facilitate, or at least to throw no obstacle in the way of, the restoration of the Society at the fitting time. Wherever the brief was published, or at all notified, and the secular power did not interfere, the Jesuits at once obeyed its tenor, and even where its publication was forbidden by the secular power friendly to the Jesuits, as in Prussia, they entreated, and



sometimes obtained permission to disperse. In China, where no constraint but that of censure could reach them, they at once abandoned their flourishing missions, and compromised themselves with the emperor to obey the Pope. In Russia, however, neither was the publication of the brief permitted, nor would the empress allow the fathers to abandon the conventual life. The Père de Ravignan enters minutely into the painful controversy to which this circumstance gave rise, and certainly his facts would go far to prove the possibility, at the very least, that the Pope was not displeased with the exclusion of the brief, and the preservation of the Society in statu quo in Prussia; an exclusion which there is no doubt was regarded by Pius VII. as a direct interposition of God. We have not space at this stage of the subject to give an abstract of the statement of the Père de Ravignan, but we cannot avoid expressing our concurrence in one remark which appears so striking and so reasonable, that we apprehend few will be disposed to dissent from it. It is too much the habit, he says, to exclude the Society from the benefit of the common law in every matter. The very persons who lay the most grievous imputations upon the Jesuits, are most clamorous for heroic sacrifices and magnificent supererogation on the part of criminals, who, if they were the tithe as bad as they are represented, would be fitter subjects for a pillory than for an altar. It is perfectly well known to be the common law of the Church, that a brief does not command obedience prior to publication; and yet, in the presence of such prompt and absolute obedience, not only when obedience was enforced, but when it was possible, there can be no condemnation too harsh for the few Jesuits who, under the iron dominion of Russia, continued in the conventual life, which, right or wrong, they were taught to believe was not displeasing to the Holy Father; and which, under any circumstances, was completely lawful for them to adhere to until the publication of the brief.

We have not given even an outline of the Père de Ravignan's book, nor have we even touched upon all the heads of his statements. It does not appear to us, however, that he has left anything unsaid that could be urged in any view of the subject. Assuming his facts to be authentic, and we do not well see how they can be disputed, his case is clearly made out. On the other hand,

he has never been 'wanting in deference, we might say in tenderness, for the memory of Clement XIV., and we do not think that Fr. Theiner can read this work, which is after all a pendant to his own, without an increased respect for its eminent author. The extracts we have already ventured on are sufficient proof that the book has not been written in a controversial, or drily argumentative spirit. It boldly takes an apologetic stand, so that there is no restraint put upon the affectionate warmth, and no toning down of the sadness with which the author speaks of the disasters of his well beloved mother—the Society. The following extract gives a moving picture of the dolorous resignation of the Jesuits after the suppression.

“God, the principle of all good, is the Author of the sweetest affections of the heart of man. His compassionate goodness inclining towards the creature in the midst of the evils and trials which the order of his providence attaches to our passage upon earth; has deigned to lodge in the sanctuary of our souls a twofold love, as pure as it is strong; the love of country and the love of family; a double consolation, a double refuge amid the fatigues of the journey of life. Accordingly, this profound and universal sentiment of nature has always included amongst the most poignant sorrows, amongst the heaviest misfortunes, exile from the native soil and domestic roof, the loss of country and family, the sacrifice imposed upon the just and innocent man, to divorce himself violently from all his recollections and all his habits, from the tenderest and most necessary affections. And when the existence is thus mutilated and distorted, and when no term appears in the future, presenting to the hope of the unfortunate exile, the happy hour of return, the joy of restoration and the recovered union, with all that his best and purest years had loved; then indeed a deep sadness becomes, as it were, the home and the resting-place of the exile. For him everything is waste. At least he shall have from us what he well may claim at our hands,—a brotherly sympathy and a word of true commiseration.—Ah if we were in his place!

“Shall I be blamed if, after having faithfully detailed, without lamentation and without complaint, the persecutions, the anguish, the protracted agony, and the end of the religious, my fathers, I revert for a moment to the dolorous oppression, to the brutal expulsions, to the dungeons, to the insults that overwhelmed the proscribed? What I picture to myself most vividly is, the violent separation of loving brethren, and I am with them and of them, in the midst of those farewells that rent their souls. To them it was far more cruel than banishment and exile,—far more heart-breaking than the loss of country or family. The religious has received a second birth and second baptism by the profession of the life

and of the rule to which the divine vocation has devoted his understanding, his heart, his entire being. There, by a love which has its source in supernatural grace, he forms ties stronger, sweeter, and more worth than those which bind him to the native soil or own fireside. The vows, the regular discipline, life in such absolute community ; the spirit vivifying the body, and diffused throughout every member ; the inheritance bequeathed by saints, who lived the same life, wrought at the same labours, nourished the same thoughts ; that irrevocable gift of our entire future to the Society which has adopted us as her children,—the profound confidence which, under her maternal authority, is a shelter everywhere, at all times, in every need of soul and body ; all these things contribute to cement that love, more powerful than nature, more powerful than death, which identifies us in the religious profession with our brethren, with the labours, the works, the successes, the reverses, the very life of the Society.

“The love of the Society, the grace of the Society, the union of the Society belong to that class of hidden enjoyments which are scarcely to be expressed, and cannot certainly be understood outside the transformed elements that go to make up this religious family and country. Accordingly, when the dissolution is decreed, the vocation broken, the sentence of death pronounced ; an unspeakable martyrdom is consummated : the religious ceasing to be so, without ceasing to love his vocation, is a man stripped in a moment of treasures a thousand times more precious than life, family, existence—it is an affliction widely differing from that of banishment and exile. The religious childhood of the novitiate, those studies so peaceably pursued, those long and lovely exercises of the great retreat, the conversation and friendship of brethren given you by God Himself, the absence of all solicitude, the comfort of an exact but not indigent poverty, which shows the hand of Providence open to clothe, to feed, to caress His darling children, the happy administration of a paternal superiority, and the sacred ties of a community of trials, prayers, efforts, sufferings, and joys, in every country in the world ; all this constitutes a laborious but inexpressible felicity, the loss of which is bitter as the bitterest misfortune. There remains, then, in that asylum which is called resignation, a secret and respectful worship of sorrow, that overwhelms and that is loved.

“Two examples out of myriads will help us to understand these sentiments.

“From the remote exile to which the suppression of the order in France had condemned him, a Jesuit, whose name is dear to literature and the muses, Fr. François Desbillons, expressed in moving terms, full of religious and sorrowful resignation, his affliction at the total extinction of the Society of Jesus by the authority of the supreme head of the Church. He writes from Manheim, (17 Feb., 1774,) to his brother, M. Terasse Desbillons, a distinguished magis-

trate of the province of Berry, ' You still call me Jesuit in the superscription of your letter. I feel your kindness, for it is a name that will always remain in my heart. It is probably as a Frenchman you think I am entitled to it. That may apply to our father who remain in France, because, if we are truly informed, no bishop has communicated to them the Pope's brief, but it has been communicated to me, as well as to our German fathers. I am no longer a Jesuit, because I must obey the orders of my lawful superiors, who will not have me bear that glorious name. Call me Reverend Father simply. Any priest may be called Reverend Father. What remains to me over and above is, that no one can prevent me from being a religious, in other words, consecrated to God in a special manner, not by solemn vows, since the Pope has annulled them, but by my adherence to practices of which I am master.

* * * * *

" ' The destruction of the Society of Jesus is, my dear brother the severest trial I have ever had to undergo. God has supported and continues to support me. Every hour I do my utmost to be cheerful, for I know that our supreme master does not wish us to make a show of sorrow : *hilarem datorem diligit Deus*.

" ' I often remember I have seen Terasse, your eldest son, when he was only a little monkey, sing and cry at the same time ' What's that ! ' you used to say, when he was in tears for some little mishap ; ' come, now, let me hear you sing the pretty song. The child wept, and sobbed, and sung at the same time. A good lesson *ex ore infantium*. I am too old to weep, neither do I sob, but there comes upon me continually a terrible oppression of sadness then I endeavour to sing, and, in fact, I do sing when I am alone. It has even happened to me once to sing at table with two or three of our fathers at Schwetzingen, with one of the most celebrated musicians of Europe, not to say the most celebrated and accomplished of any we know. He has been the admiration of Rome, Naples, Lisbon, Vienna, and places innumerable. This good man, an excellent and edifying Christian, is named Rapt ; he is a downright Jesuit. This voice of mine, as you know, is nothing to boast of and yet he said I sang with taste. Let this be told en passant for those who say, at best, I am *only fit to write fables*.

" ' Do you know, my dear brother, what gives me most consolation in my misfortunes ? It is the knowledge that my present trials serve to detach me from the earth, and dispose me gradually to pass, as I hope, to a better life.

" ' I will just add that I count on the restoration of the Jesuits one day or other.' "—421-6.

We have no occasion to repeat our own opinion of the work before us. It has been very successful in France,

and will, we have no doubt, be equally successful amongst reasoning men in all countries. Its qualities of style are to us the least consideration, or, rather, we lost sight of them altogether in the importance of the matter. It is not intended as a piece of eloquence to furbish up a case, but a statement of facts with a running commentary, occasionally animated and moving, but never intemperate. The Père de Ravignan is certainly not the panegyrist of Clement XIV., but so far from taking the opposite character, he acknowledges both the virtues and worth of that Pontiff, makes allowance for the difficulty in which he was placed, suggests the most charitable as well as the most apparent motives for all his acts, never imputes a sinister design or wrong intent, defends the canonicity of his election, and shows himself in every particular as tender of the reputation of the Holy See and as submissive to its authority as Father Theiner could desire. No one, we should think, ought to give the work a heartier welcome than the distinguished Oratorian. His object as regards Clement XIV. and the Holy See, was identical with that of our author here; the difference between them is frequently one rather of expression than of sentiment. With both authors the sole object is the ascertainment and confirmation of the truth. "We take it to our conscience," says Fr. Theiner in his preface, "and call God to witness that we have undertaken this work purely in the interest of the Church and of truth." The Père de Ravignan, whom we have already quoted, makes the same declaration and with like solemnity. This much, at least, Fr. Theiner will be able to collect from the work to which his own has led; namely, that the Père de Ravignan is not to be classed with those, to the removal of whose misconceptions "the History of the Pontificate of Clement XIV." had been devoted. "There is hardly any name in history," says Fr. Theiner, "so much misunderstood or so unjustly dealt with by others as that of Clement XIV. Even noble minded and moderate Catholics, whose number happily for the Church still preponderates, cannot speak of Clement XIV. without being seared, without a kind of holy horror." (Scheu.) Others also, Catholics, but of indiscreet zeal, which is not according to the spirit of heavenly wisdom, treat him as a man, who, with a sinful craving after empty honours, and almost sold to the evil spirit of the time; yielded to the seeming

force of circumstances, fawned on the princes of the world, and to please them, sacrificed, like a coward, the most sacred rights of the Church through weakness or through treason." The Père de Ravignan, it is sufficiently plain, we should hope, belongs to neither of the classes for whom Fr. Theiner wrote; and, were we allowed another hope, it would be that the controversy, if it can be called so, might close here, not only between the principals, as we feel sure it must, but between all who share their views on one side or the other.

We are acting in the spirit of Père de Ravignan's work when we abstain from remarks of a purely controversial character, or any attempt to make what might be called a rebutting case for the Society. Had we Father Theiner's book directly under review, a rather different task might be imposed upon us, from that to which we have been limited by the very nature of the Père de Ravignan's essay. It would then become our duty to point out the numerous inaccuracies into which the learned author has been betrayed, and which are thickly scattered throughout his two ample volumes. Father Curci has disposed of a good many of them by anticipation in his "*Divinazione sulle tre ultime opere di Vincenzo Gioberti*," and it is greatly to be regretted that Father Theiner, who notices Curci's celebrated book in his own preface to the "*History of the Pontificate of Clement XIV.*" has attended rather to the spirit in which he conceives that able work to have been written, than to the facts and arguments which it embodies. Other writers, whether members or friends of the Society, have dealt less forbearingly with Fr. Theiner than the Père de Ravignan has thought proper to do; and notwithstanding our extreme respect for the learning and virtues of the eminent Oratorian, we are bound to say that we can easily enter into the feelings of the apologists of the Society. They have commented with a bitterness perhaps to be deprecated, but certainly to be understood upon the unseasonableness of the work, and the fatality which would seem, however wrongfully, to make Theiner the yoke-mate of Gioberti. The consideration weighed so much with Fr. Theiner himself, that he postponed the publication of his book from '48 to '52, and we have only to deplore that it has not been held back, according to the advice of Horace, until at least the ninth year; so that something might have occurred to modify the views as well as to correct the

erroneous impressions and false information of the Author. It is matter of regret also that the obvious impolicy of dividing the strength of religion and frittering it away in bye-battles at a moment when absolute union and hearty co-operation was required amongst the friends of order and religion, did not present itself more forcibly to Fr. Theiner. Even now, if it were useful or wholesome to prolong the controversy, we could cite twenty instances in which the author has been so ludicrously mis-informed as to make us painfully sensible how easy it is for even the most gifted and well intentioned to err when they accept anything upon authority that they have not absolutely tested. The entire work is as full of "on dits," on matters compromising the character of the Society, as a column of fashionable intelligence in the *Morning Post*. Many things are stated as fact, even without this qualification, for which the author gives no authority whatever, and some expressions applied to members of the Society and their acts, are wounding and intemperate to say the least. We shall confine ourselves to one instance of mis-statement just by way of sample, and if it be any justification of Fr. Theiner, to say that he makes it on the authority of a dispatch from the anti-Jesuit nuncio at Paris to his own court, the author is of course entitled to it. The Père de la Vrillière, an ex-Jesuit, son of the Duc de la Vrillière, according to the Nuncio and Fr. Theiner, indulged in language disrespectful to the Holy See, from the pulpit of the "Missions Etrangères," on the Feast of St. Francis Xavier, 1773, the year of the suppression; and not only was he suspended à divinis, by the Archbishop of Paris, the great Christophe de Beaumont, but his father, the Duc de la Vrillière, to punish him and put under control his intemperance of speech, sent him to make the spiritual exercises in the Grande Maison de Saint Lazare. Now it so happened the Nuncio must have been deceived, as there was no Jesuit, or ex-Jesuit of the name; and secondly, the Duc de la Vrillière never had children, and died shortly afterwards without an heir.

We might quote a great many other passages more or less false as to facts and dates, and we might confront Fr. Theiner of the "Pontificate of Clement XIV." with Fr. Theiner the historian of the Catholic Educational Institutes, but we have no desire to do so at present. One of the heads of accusation upon which Fr. Theiner justifies

the suppression of the society is the alleged decline, nay, the positive nullity of education, literary, philosophical, scientific and theological, in the houses of the society all the world over. As may well be imagined, nothing could be more hurtful to the feelings of the society or its friends, amongst whom, notwithstanding all that may be said to the contrary, the great mass of the friends of religion must be classed, than so outrageous a proposition. We are, therefore, more pleased than surprised to see this branch of the subject taken up by one who is not a Jesuit himself, but, being a labourer in the same field as the Jesuits, is thoroughly able to appreciate their system—its working and its results at every period of their history. The learned apologist, to whom we allude, is himself a Professor in a French College, maintaining an honourable rivalry with the Jesuit establishments, now so numerous and flourishing in France; the Abbe Maynard, honorary canon of Poitiers; and Professor of Rhetoric in the great establishment of Pontlevoy, has undertaken the vindication of the teaching of the society in a small but pithy volume, of which we have an American translation on our table, but which, unfortunately, reached us too late for more than mention. We only give expression to our earnest wish, in recommending the public to master it well. For our own part we have never seen more matter in so short a space. Some of the positions of Fr. Theiner in reference to this subject of the Jesuit teaching, are so singular in themselves, and so strangely at variance with his own previous ideas on the subject, that one is lost in astonishment at meeting with them. The most startling of all, perhaps, has regard to the reformation of University studies at Coimbra, after the expulsion of the society; “the execution of which important measure,” says Fr. Theiner, “was intrusted by the king to the minister and the Council of Censure over which the Cardinal da Cunha presided, who, with the entire approbation of the Apostolic Nuncio, engaged in the glorious work of the scientific and literary regeneration of Portugal,” surely one is tempted to say in God’s name, When or how has Portugal been regenerated in any sense literary, political, or religious, much less gloriously regenerated? and the temptation is stronger when we remember Fr. Theiner’s words in his “Annals of Religious Sciences for 1836,” where he says “the Professors of the University of Coimbra have utterly destroyed

true science in Portugal. The Government of Pombal and its effects in Portugal furnish a most triumphant apology for the Society of Jesus." The teaching of the society in Germany fares no better in Fr. Theiner's hands—he says broadly that they found good theologians in Germany, and left none behind them at their suppression; that the long inferiority of German theology is due to their teaching, and its present advancement to their withdrawal; in substance, if not in terms, that Catholicity owes them nothing, and Protestantism a great deal. Yet as M. l'Abbé Maynard calls to mind, those great theologians whom the Jesuits found in Germany, had allowed twenty-one years to elapse in Vienna without an ordination, and the Protestants to outnumber the Catholics in the proportion of ten to one in those provinces where now the proportion is reversed, and reversed as all, Protestant and Catholic admit, by the instrumentality of the Jesuits; whose success in every department of instruction, sacred and profane, is acknowledged by none more candidly than by Protestants themselves. M. Maynard takes up every proposition of Fr. Theiner upon this matter *seriatim*; and there is nothing he shows more effectually, without any pomp of words, often by the mere catalogue of names, but in sober though vigorous language, than that at the very epoch of the suppression, and for years afterwards, the men most eminent in all the sciences, sacred and secular, were Jesuits, ex-Jesuits or pupils of the order. We cannot say how much we regret not being in a position to give some extracts from this admirable work.

Whoever thinks he can vindicate the memory of a Sovereign Pontiff does no more than his duty in making the attempt, and does much if he succeed. The "Popes in general, according to the motto chosen by the Père de Ravignan, from Le Maistre, only require truth for their defence, "*Les Papes n'ont besoin que de la Vérité,*" and from studies such as those in which Fr. Theiner and our author have been engaged, prosecuted with simplicity of purpose, and afterwards made public without bitterness, nothing but good can result. There is no age of Church history not pregnant with lessons for the future and the present. The Church, in fact, has had throughout her annals one only enemy to deal with, and that one is the world. He shifts his ground or changes his tactics according to circumstances. Three hundred years ago his arms

offensive and defensive, were such as would now be accounted cumbrous and unserviceable ; but they were the best known at the time, and they answered the purpose just as well then, as his present weapons with all the modern improvements, serve him now. But there is still in his style of attack, whether he proceed by sap or storm, a something that keeps up his personal identity. For instance, no matter how impetuous his assault, no matter how obstinate his blockade, he is always ready to make terms specious and splendid, but perfidious and fatal. If a national church covet the riches and finery of his followers, he and they will soon oppress her with their bounty, as the Sabine soldiers rewarded the treason of the Roman maiden at the first siege of Rome. In the Middle Ages the attack was always made through the kings ; towards the close of the Middle Ages texts of Scripture were the pellets ; when Clement XIV. reigned, and the Jesuits were suppressed, philosophy was captain-general ; the attack now comes less from king and sophist than from the people ; from the savage selfishness of the passions, at once disorganized and organized of democracy. Protestantism decomposing into materialism, and generating swarms of hungry ambitions, artificial wants, and stinging cupidities, from its very dissolution ; has filled the air with darkness and with murmurs. The earth seems to shake off thrones as though they sat heavy on her ; she thinks it mean to be the footstool even of God ; and believes, like her poor children, that she is self-poised and independent. The world has this time veiled his brows like Mokannah, and borrowing a new name, calls himself the State—a monster of the fancy, that is neither a man nor a corporation,—that is pulled down and set up at pleasure,—that is only known for a god like the dragon of the Assyrians, by all that it devours ; but that in every form is the enemy of the Church. This is not authority—the one is from God, the other from ourselves ; to the one we must render obedience, but to the other, which is the grand enemy, which is neither Cæsar nor the Commonwealth, but an abstraction of the economists, or if not an abstraction, an association of adventurers, we have only to offer opposition and defiance. Whether it attempt to fetter education, to confiscate our rights social or religious, to suppress convents, or oppress conscience, it must be encountered by every means that God and honour sanction. And in this conflict with the


world, whatever shape it borrow, king, corruption, heresiarch, sophist, socialist, or state ; the reverses and successes of the Church have been so uniform as to keep alert and vigorous the spirits of us who are in the struggle, and make us strong in hope. Threatening as things appear, how signal have not our successes been since the great convulsion of '48. Though Peidmont and Spain are, the one upon the steep incline, and the other in the very depth of anarchy ; yet the religious revival and enfranchisement of education in France and Austria ; the freshness of life and action in all that deserves the name of Catholic, all the world over ; and above everything, the consciousness that the storm cannot choose but overblow itself, that the waves must subside when the wind falls ; but that the rock is planted to defy both winds and waves, must give us heart and nerve. " I know at this time no less than a hundred and twenty-seven Jesuits between Charing Cross and Temple Bar," says Mr. Croker, in the " Good Natured Man." We cannot say so much of our own knowledge, but we can avouch the fact that, where there is anything like public opinion and personal freedom,—whatever be the form of government, the Jesuits have trebled their numbers within the last twenty years ; and that it is only under the most gross and besotted despotism, whether of the one, the few, or the many, that the Jesuits are proscribed, doubted, or feared. Nor is this increase confined to the Jesuits. In our own country, as in every other, where civil rights are protected by serious laws, religious communities of men and women, with no protection but that of justice, and no privilege but the right of citizenship, have successfully vindicated for themselves the inestimable liberty of association. Wherever revolution has not grown into confirmed anarchy, or subsided into flat despotism,—wherever it has not swept away the first notions of law along with all its ancient constitutions, the Church has been the gainer. Be it our part to struggle, not only with the spirit of the age, when we must, but in it when we can. To understand our position is to be master of it. Liberty has not made one real conquest that we cannot appropriate and secure, but let Providence shape events in the way it pleases, any time between the year of our Lord 1855 and the coming of Antichrist, the hopes of our enemies are not likely to be higher, nor the prospects of the Church more gloomy than they were the morning after

the publication of the Brief, “ Dominus ac Redemptor.”
‘The Church is still upon her Rock, the Jesuits increase
and multiply. ET NUNC REGES INTELLIGITE.

ART. V.—1. *The Tablet*, 1855.

2. *The Weekly Register*, for August 1855.

AN action against a Catholic Priest or Prelate must *prima facie* suggest the suspicion of persecution; for there is a strong presumption that men invested with such a sacred character are not likely to have committed any such wrong or injustice, as appears to be implied in a liability to an action. An accurate acquaintance, indeed, with the law of England, might inform us that, as it is not always identical with justice, its infraction might not necessarily involve any infringement of moral right; but there would, of course, be no very material difference between the false imputation of that which would be a moral wrong, and the unjust enforcement of a legal right. So, that any how, one is naturally disposed to suspect that an action against a Catholic ecclesiastic is likely to prove a piece of persecution. And any one who has been engaged in a suit, even as the party suing, and knows that even *that* is such a cause of anxiety and annoyance; so wearing and worrying in its effects, that it can scarcely be compared to anything else in civilized life, can well conceive that to be the party *sued*, must be a source of such vexation as to make the suit, if unjust, no slight piece of persecution. Nor will it be much mitigated by the consciousness of its injustice. On the contrary, that is the very sting of the injury. Upon the hypothesis we assume—that the party sued is a person of conscience—of course there could scarcely be a *just* suit against him; for if he felt, not merely that there was any sort of right to compensation, but that compensation could be conceded without com-



promise to character—the conceding it would be a cheap means of purchasing peace and exemption from an annoyance less endurable than any mere pecuniary loss. But it is the sense of the injustice of the suit, coupled with the sense of the glorious uncertainty of the law—the “law’s delays”—and the state of intermediate suspense as to the ultimate issue—it is all this, which, even in any case of an unjust suit, contributes so great a cause of vexation as often to induce even laymen to make great concessions to avoid litigation. And the annoyance would, of course, be greater in proportion to the sacredness of the party’s character, and the sensitiveness of his nature. Such an one will feel more keenly the vexation, while, on the other hand, the very sacredness of his character, and the sense of what is due to it, will make him more averse to the least approach to anything like the compromise of a charge; so that the very same conscientiousness which would preserve him from a just suit, will render him less likely to get rid of an *unjust* one. These are considerations which must make an action at law against a Cardinal Archbishop (we believe the first on the legal annals of England; certainly the first legal procedure against a Catholic Prelate of such rank, since the information filed against Cardinal Wolsey under Henry VIII.) a matter of no small interest. The fact that the action was brought against him by one of his clergy, has, of course, painfully enhanced the interest: the farther fact that the action was notoriously promoted by Protestants, has lent to it still more of public and Catholic interest, and stamped upon it unmistakeably that character, which, even apart from such positive evidence, would have been *a priori*, a matter of fair presumption. To all this it may be added, that even independent of any reference to the parties, there have been points in the history and nature of the action calculated to impart to it great legal and moral interest. Nor is this all, for the greatest organ of English feeling, the *Times*, thought the occasion worthy of repeated endeavours to attract public attention to the suit, and excite public expectation to the hoped-for issue, as likely to prove discreditable to the illustrious Prelate, and thus to “inflict a heavy blow and great discouragement” upon the Catholic Church in this country. Now, under these circumstances we are disinclined to let it pass away without any further reference or

record than has been afforded in the columns of our excellent hebdomadal contemporaries.

A few words by way—as the lawyers say—of preamble. Some years ago, the Cardinal, then Bishop or Vicar Apostolic of the London district, thought it right to remove the priests of the Islington mission, (which was then in a state of some embarrassment,) with the view of effecting a change of system. The senior priest, the pastor of the mission, an excellent and worthy man, at once acquiesced in his Bishop's desire, and departed in peace.* There was an *assistant* priest, answering to a licensed curate in an Established Church; not the pastor of the mission: not even attached to the diocese—a priest who had lately been led to leave the Jesuits,† and had been placed upon the mission by Dr. Griffiths. This priest resided in the mission-house, to fit up which that venerable Prelate had given him £150, and he now objected to leave, at all events without receiving “compensation” for monies he alleged he had laid out on the house.‡ A correspondence ensued between

* Indeed we understand that he had applied to be removed.

† By means of their tendering to him one of the vows of their order which he declined to take; the consequence being, as he knew, that he must leave the order. This was in substance the account he himself gave at the Kingston trial; there is no English word to express precisely the effect of such a mode of leaving. It is not exactly expulsion; and most certainly it is not a voluntary departure. The French language afforded an expression suited to the case, and the Cardinal used it; *renvoyé*.

‡ The claim was £600!!! We should be curious to see the *items* of which this claim was composed, and deeply regret that reluctant coyness which led the reverend gentleman to withhold them. It would be edifying to know how, (*in addition* to £150. received from the bishop,) the assistant priest of an embarrassed mission could have laid out £600. in fitting up a house! Seven hundred and fifty pounds were represented as lost or laid out in repairs, furniture, or fittings; by which must be understood, we presume, fittings such as could not be removed; for surely the reverend gentleman could hardly expect compensation for things he could remove and carry away with him! No wonder the bishop asked for items, and no wonder they were not forthcoming. Moreover the fact that Bishop Griffiths gave £150. for the purpose, surely serves to signify what he deemed sufficient for it. Does it not stir one's blood to think of a noble-minded and generous prelate

him and Bishop Wiseman, of which the upshot was this ; that the Right Rev. Prelate invited him to lay an estimate before the Diocesan Board or Council, (composed, as we all know, of some of the most respected and experienced priests in the diocese,) but this the priest declined to do : and still objected to leave the mission house, until, after preparations were made with a view to legal procedure, he ultimately left, and published the correspondence by way of appeal to the congregation and the Catholic public. Of this step he afterwards professed to see the impropriety, and, generally upon the whole transaction, made a submission to the Bishop, upon which a reconciliation took place. He had declined, however, other mission work which was offered him by the Bishop,* and so matters remained. This was about the time of the hierarchy. Some time afterwards there appeared in the *Ami de Religion* letters signed by the editor, the Abbé Cognat, violently assailing the Cardinal for arbitrary conduct towards his clergy, and especially commenting on the case of this priest as one of great cruelty on the part of the Cardinal ; drawing a pathetic picture of a “venerable priest” driven out of his sacred duties by the Cardinal, compelled from necessity to betake himself to secular employment to support himself ! Surely the most saintly man might not only be excused, but justified in feeling an honest indignation at being so held up to execration before all Europe, in a charge for which there was not the least shadow of foundation. Moreover, there was internal evidence on the face of the

being held up to the world as “arbitrary” or harsh, because he did not concede such a claim as this ! And yet this was the gravamen of the plaintiff’s grievance. The libel was the technical formal ground of complaint ; but the real cause of the action, after years of interval, was the *removal*.

It was represented in the speech of the plaintiff’s counsel, (in which we hope he exceeded his instructions,) that all compensation had been refused. This was an egregious and calumnious untruth, as the printed correspondence proves. The Cardinal had asked for particulars of the claim, and was willing that it should be submitted to a body of brother priests of the claimant’s. What could be fairer ? And could calumny go further than representing this as harsh or unjust ? Surely the force of slander could no further go !

* And we believe also by another prelate.

letter that it could not have been written by the French editor, the Abbé, whose name it bore, but that its authorship was English. Further, as the facts of the case it referred to could only have been derived, mediately or immediately, from the priest in question, and he had declared upon his submission and reconciliation, that he had suppressed his pamphlet, containing the correspondence, the only record of the case that had been published; the inference was a most natural one, that he had written, or been concerned in writing the article in the *Ami de Religion*; an inference, however, not very important, as it was manifest that the materials for the charge must have come at all events mediately and remotely from him.*

The Cardinal deemed, (and who can doubt,) that it was necessary for the vindication of his character, in the eyes of the French episcopate, and of all Europe, that he should publish an explanation of the case. And he wrote such vindication in English accordingly, and placed it at the disposal of the *Univers*. Be it observed that the *gravamen* of the accusation was arbitrary and unjust conduct to his clergy. The *instance* adduced was the removal of Mr. Boyle. And this was made the means of aiming a blow at the Cardinal's conduct in regard to the hierarchy, for it was said that Mr. Boyle had been removed on account of his opposition to the "ultramontane" party, to whom the hierarchy was ascribed, and that he was (a venerable and oppressed priest,) a specimen of many others, (equally venerable and experienced, if not equally oppressed,) who were opposed to the establishment of the hierarchy, and chiefly upon that ground disapproved of the conduct of the Cardinal, who had promoted the measure. It was not, therefore, only the character of the Archbishop but the conduct of the Holy See which was attacked, for the establishment of the hierarchy was the act of the Holy See; and the wisdom of the Chair of St. Peter was not the less impeached because it was suggested that it had

* We have heard that a priest, well known in Paris, informed a friend of the Cardinal's that he had seen one of the letters in its original English, and that the name of the author was like Doyle. It is not a point of any importance, but it is a curious fact that in the Guildford cause list, the name of the plaintiff was actually spelt Doyle.

been deceived by the Cardinal ; a supposition not very consistent with any theory whatever of Papal Infallibility or Papal Supremacy. It became, then, of importance that Europe and the Church should be informed how far the priest referred to in this article as a specimen of others of similar opinions upon the subject, represented the pious and zealous clergy of England, and it was almost as much in defence of them, or of the Holy See, as of himself, that the Cardinal took up the pen. His Eminence chose, as the channel of his vindication, (and he could scarcely have chosen any other,) the channel through which he had been assailed, and he appealed to the press, as the only available means of giving speedy and general circulation to his defence of the Holy See, of his clergy, and of himself. Of the Holy See, for its conduct in establishing the hierarchy depended a good deal on the feelings of the English clergy with regard to it ; of the clergy, for it was represented that they very generally disapproved of it ; and of himself, as accused of arbitrary conduct, dictated by favouritism and ambition. It was the *gravamen* of the charge that the priest referred to had been persecuted for his opposition to the conduct of the Cardinal, and that he favourably and fairly represented the English clergy. That being the *gravamen* of the charge, of course the gist of the defence was, that this priest, whoever he was, did not fairly represent the English clergy, and that the specific statements made with respect to him showed that he did not, or were unfounded in fact. It is to be observed that neither in the attack, nor in the answer, was the *name* of the priest mentioned ; he could only be identified by the circumstances mentioned in the *Ami de Religion*, and the Cardinal could only assume that the facts stated of him (except so far as he knew them to be false,) were true. One of the facts so stated, as to which the Cardinal of course hardly knew whether it was true or false, was, that the priest in question was engaged in an office. This was stated in the attack, and the Cardinal assumed it to be true, and said if so, there was only one priest in his arch-diocese to whom it could possibly apply, and so he identified him. Thinking it, for the reasons above referred to, very important that the antecedents of this priest should be known, so that it should, on the one hand, be seen that he did not fairly represent the English clergy, and, on the other hand, that the specific statements made with respect

to him were false, the Cardinal alluded to him as having been *renvoyé* from the Jesuits, a word which he carefully wrote in French in his English manuscript, but in the place of which the word "*expulsé*" appeared in the French version which the *Univers* put forth. This letter was translated into the *Tablet* and *Standard*, and of course that word was translated "expelled." And in those two allusions consisted, we believe, the *gist* of the alleged "libel," for which forthwith an action was brought against the Cardinal, in the Court of Exchequer, by the Rev. Richard Boyle, who, in his declaration, set forth the letter as it appeared in print in the *Univers*, *Tablet*, and *Standard*, complained that the Cardinal had "*maliciously*" published a "*false and malicious libel*" against him, the Rev. Richard Boyle, in his *character as a Catholic priest*, deprived him of preferment (!) and so forth. So here were four things charged,—1. That the letter was a libel; 2. That the libel related to Mr. Boyle; 3. That the *Cardinal published it as it appeared in print*; 4. That he published it *maliciously*. The first was a question of law, and, we believe, depended mainly on the word *expulsé*, which, as we have seen, the Cardinal never wrote. If anything else in the letter was libellous, it could only be the allusion to the employment in an office, which surely could scarcely be slanderous! and if it were, was innocently adopted and assumed to be true by the Cardinal, on account of its being stated in the article in the *Ami*.

It is a curious thing that an action should have been brought for a supposed libel, in saying of a man that he had been dismissed from the Jesuits; seeing that Holt held it in his time a libel to say of a man that he was a Papist, on account of the laws against Popery; upon which principle it would surely rather be libellous to say of a man that he was a Jesuit, than that he had left the Jesuits, or even had been expelled by them; for *non constat* but that it might have been for not conforming to those "mysteries of iniquity" which Mr. Drummond imputes to them. Anyhow it might have suggested some suspicions to Mr. Boyle, when he found his action very much patronized by certain zealous Protestants,—that this sympathy could scarcely arise from sincere zeal on behalf of a Popish priest, complaining of an imputation on his character *as a Priest*, and especially in connection with the order of the Jesuits!

However, Mr. Boyle found friends among the Protestants,—they opened a subscription in support of the action which, in due course proceeded. And the first question the Cardinal's adviser had to consider was, what he should *plead*.^{*} Those advisers were, of course, Mr. Sergeant Shee, and with him Mr. Bramwell, one of the most sensible men at the bar, Mr. Willes, now a judge, and Mr. Baddeley. The question depended chiefly upon the nature of the Cardinal's defence. And that, as we have seen, was, 1, that he had never published, nor authorised the publication of the letter *as printed*, containing the expression principally, if not exclusively obnoxious: 2, that without that expression there was no libel: 3, that even assuming that there was, there was no legal malice, because the circumstances of the occasion rebutted the presumption of malice ordinarily arising from the publication of a libel. All these three grounds of defence arose under the plea of *not guilty*, which included not merely (as people loosely supposed) the publication by some one of some sort of libel, but the publication *by the Cardinal of the precise letter, printed and complained of*. These were the real grounds of defence. It was impossible to plead the truth of the libel, (in legal language to "justify,") for that plea, 1, would confess the malice; 2, would confess the publication of the libel *as printed*, (both which things the Cardinal *denied*, and could not *admit*,) and 3, it would require proof of the precise terms used in print, which was impossible, because the term *expulsion* was not true. More-

* It would be inexcusable to mention this distinguished lawyer without paying him our tribute of admiration for the wise, able, and masterly manner in which he conducted this most trying cause, which tasked to the utmost in its successive stages, all the rare and excellent qualities of a great advocate. Mr. Sergeant Shee combines some of the most rare and most valuable of them,—moral dignity, manly firmness, and undisturbable good humour; and these invaluable attributes which have gained him in a very unusual degree the respect of the Bench and the affection of the bar—were displayed in an extraordinary degree on the different occasions on which this cause came into court. Moreover the Sergeant possesses a manly and commanding eloquence which was exerted most powerfully at the second trial. His speech was really a splendid effort of forensic eloquence; and if he failed with the jury, he ultimately succeeded with the court.

over, the declaration stated that the Cardinal had written and published the alleged libel in the *French* language. This was utterly false; for the letter to the Editor of the *Univers* was written in *English*, with the exception of the word *renvoyé*, which was inserted in French to prevent mistake, thinking no English word precisely conveying the meaning of the French word. Further, the declaration stated that the Cardinal had caused the alleged libel to be translated and published in the *Tablet* and the *Catholic Standard*. This also was quite false, the Cardinal having had no concern whatever in the publication. Was the Cardinal to confess as against himself, all these untrue statements? If not, he was driven to plead not guilty; and a plea of justification would have confessed the truth of their false assertions. Hence, therefore, the Cardinal's advisers resolved to plead simply *not guilty*. And so the cause came down for trial in 1854 at the Summer Assizes for Surrey, before Lord Chief Baron Pollock, at Guildford.

We have been particular in explaining the grounds upon which the Cardinal pleaded *not guilty*, because, in court on the day of trial, out of court after trial, at the second trial, and in the press, it was actually made matter of coarse imputation upon the Cardinal, that he had pleaded a false plea! The son of a Peer—a member of the Bar—of high and honourable character, was so carried away by prejudice, as to exclaim to the writer, that it was “discreditable;” and this was the general feeling expressed at the bar and in the best society. Could there be a more remarkable and lamentable instance of the force of prejudice! Here were amiable and honourable men, so in haste to condemn, so eager to mulct and convict a Catholic Prelate, that they professed to be indignant with him for presuming to balk their desire for vengeance, by interposing the ordinary rules of law, and refusing to admit that he had done what he had *not* done, and published what he had taken pains *not* to publish! Not in this spirit did the Lord Chief Baron try the cause. A wonderful and venerable man; considerably above the age of seventy,—yet, with eye undimmed, and faculties unimpaired, and the native nobleness of his soul unaffected by the perverting power of prejudice,—a lofty-minded judge, in moral character much resembling the late Lord Denman, and like him incapable of lending himself to the petty purposes of persecution.

Many years have elapsed since the writer recognized in Sir Frederick Pollock those qualities by which he had long elevated and adorned the Bar; and now dignifies the Bench. Therefore, the eulogies now applied to Sir F. Pollock, are not merely dictated by his conduct on this occasion, which the writer, with confidence anticipated, from the known character of the Lord Chief Baron. The Cardinal received from him a kind and considerate courtesy, which contrasted sadly and shamefully with the rancour and malevolence exhibited towards the illustrious Primate by some Catholics and many Protestants. The Lord Chief Baron recognized the claims to respect of illustrious attainments and exalted ecclesiastical rank, and he showed that he perfectly appreciated the spirit of the action.

The Cardinal was kindly accommodated in the Lord Chief Baron's room during the trial, for which the plaintiff had *subpœned* him as a witness. They were not anxious, however, to call him if they could avoid it, as his evidence, of course, might destroy their case, and they strove to prove his publication of a letter which he had *not* published, by producing the Rev. Hardinge Ivers, who said *he* had written the article in the *Ami*: and offered to produce notes of a letter he professed to have seen from the Cardinal to the Abbé Cognat, in Paris, admitting, or alluding to his authorship of the letter. The Cardinal's counsel objected, that the original should be produced, and could not thus be superseded. The Lord Chief Baron, after consulting Mr. Justice Erle, decided in favour of the objection; and when, after exhausting in vain all endeavours to prove the publication, the plaintiff's counsel called "Cardinal Wiseman," and the Cardinal's counsel objected that he could not be called on to give evidence against himself, in a procedure for libel, which might be made matter for criminal prosecution, (as in the case of Dr. Newman it was), the Lord Chief Baron, having determined the point in favour of the Cardinal, declined to compel His Eminence to appear in the box, as his appearance there would answer no purpose but annoyance. The plaintiff's counsel showed the utmost eagerness to have the Cardinal in the box, although the Judge had ruled that he could be asked no question as to the publication—the sole point at issue. And it was obvious that the only motive was the desire to inflict annoyance, and take vengeance for a failure which it was now seen was inevitable. In vain. The Lord Chief

Baron was firm, and, amidst much excitement, non-suited the plaintiff.

The streets of Guildford were filled that day with gentlemen—barristers, clergymen, and others, who could not conceal their rage, that a Roman Cardinal should have found justice before a British Judge. “The non-suit will be set aside!” they exclaimed. So it was. But how? The action was in the Court of Exchequer. Mr. Justice Erle, who had, upon consultation, agreed with the Lord Chief Baron, did not sit in that court, and the said Chief Baron (who retained his opinion, and yielded with reluctance,) was outvoted by two Judges, neither of whom was superior to himself, or Mr. Justice Erle, in strength and breadth of mind, or reputation in legal learning. To this it may be added, that it was in this case, now decided for the first time in the history of the English law, that a witness might give from memory an account of a letter he had seen in a foreign country, addressed by the defendant to a foreigner residing abroad!

The reasons for objecting to such a doctrine were confirmed by the result, at the second trial at Surrey Lent Assizes, before Mr. Baron Platt, at Kingston. The case now came before a very different kind of Judge,—one so liable to prejudice, and so violent in his prejudice, that, before he had been long on the Bench, he became involved in a painful encounter with Sir Alexander Cockburn, who, being counsel in a case* just about to be called on, heard the learned Baron make observations calculated to prejudice his client before the jury were sworn, and, therefore, with characteristic spirit, vehemently remonstrated, and threw up his brief. The learned Baron, nevertheless, insisted upon trying the case, but the verdict was set aside by the court. Such was the Judge who had now to try the cause of Boyle v. Wiseman.

Hardly had the case began, before he roughly exclaimed, that there was “nothing to try!” and soon after, when the Cardinal’s counsel offered the original letter, cried out, “You dont offer them what they want!” (i. e. an admission of the authorship of the letter *as published*,) to which Mr. (now Justice) Willes made in an expressive tone, this reply; “*Because they have no right to*

* Goldecutt v. Beagin. 11 Jurist, 514.

it !” which would have had its effect upon a Judge whose feelings were less violent, but more sensitive. However, the learned Baron soon found a witness to his mind, and was restored to good humour by the Rev. Hardinge Ivers, who proffered, as before, notes, from memory, of the letter written by the Cardinal to the Editor of the *Ami*, alluding to the letter which had appeared in the *Univers*. The Cardinal’s counsel offered the original. The plaintiff’s counsel declined it, preferring the “notes” of Mr. Ivers—why, we shall soon see. The witness swore positively, repeatedly, and deliberately, that it was *not* the original ! The Cardinal’s counsel at once offered to produce evidence that it was.* The Baron declined to receive the evidence, and rejected the original letter, allowing the witness to give his version of it, which was, that the Cardinal admitted the authorship of the letter. Then the plaintiff’s counsel put in the letter as *printed*. The Cardinal’s counsel offered the *manuscript*; it was declined, and the judge rejected it. So the publication was proved. And now the only question was as to damages.

The plaintiff’s counsel on this point principally dwelt upon the removal from Islington, *four years before the libel* ! The Baron was so carried away by his feelings that he forgot for some time that a libel published in 1854 could hardly have caused what happened in 1850 ! And he dwelt upon it even more forcibly than Mr. James ! Reminded, at last, of the difficulty of finding any connection of cause and effect, he gave the jury a cold caution not to give damages on account of the removal, which they, of course, disregarded, and returned a verdict for the plaintiff, *damages one thousand pounds* ! To appreciate this perfectly it must be observed, that there was not an atom of evidence of any actual damage,—not a suggestion of any special damage ; but there was evidence that the plaintiff

* It is hardly necessary to assure the reader that it was so. This was one reason why the plaintiff did not venture to risk another trial. The real letter did *not* contain the expression relied on by the plaintiff, and to which the witness, on the faith of his “notes from memory” had sworn. He swore that the letter proffered had been altered ! Four affidavits were filed contradicting his testimony on that point. Does not this show the peril of admitting such evidence, and the wisdom of Lord C. B. Pollock and Mr. Justice Erle in refusing to admit it ?

had, for some time before the libel, ceased to exercise missionary faculties. So it was impossible that in his priestly character he could be worse off after the libel than before it; and it was *only in his priestly* character that he complained, nor on any other score was there any libel at all! An English Protestant jury gave a *thousand pounds* against a Catholic ecclesiastic, for a libel which not only was not shown to have done any real damage, but it was proved by the facts of the case, could have done no damage; and at the very same assizes, a jury only gave £100. for a most malicious and atrocious libel, calculated and designed utterly to destroy a man in a profession he was carrying on—a charge imputing gross and scandalous misconduct. Let us then appreciate the impartiality of a Protestant jury under the sanction of an oath. Even a hundred pounds is a very rare amount to give in action for libel, and the only instance we recollect in recent times of a *thousand pounds*, was one in which the libel imputed flagrant immorality, and was couched in terms of the most beastly indecency, and *the court reduced the verdict to £200*. Again, we say, let us appreciate the impartiality of a Protestant jury! Most fortunate is it that the *Judges* have power to set aside a monstrous verdict; and they did so. Honour to the Court of Exchequer! They showed that justice has not left the old Hall of Westminster, where Cardinals have sat as Chancellors, and where Sir Thomas More once held the Seals.

Although, however, the court set aside the verdict on the ground of improper rejection and improper reception of evidence, and also on the ground of monstrous excess of damages, (and it is only when the amount is really monstrous and extravagant that a verdict can be set aside on that ground), so that they condemned both judge and jury, they refused to set it aside on a ground which would have destroyed the action altogether, viz., that the publication, assuming it to be proved, was privileged, and thereby they did most significantly condemn the Law. Even upon the theory on which the law of England deals with libel, and upon the principles it applies to the question of privilege, the decision condemns it, presuming it to have been correct, which we will not presume to dispute. For the court admitted that the law allowed the presumption of malice to be rebutted by circumstances disproving its existence, and also admitted the principle that the pre-

sumption was rebutted whenever the party published the libel for the purpose of self-defence in a matter involving either his interest or his duty. And in a case decided in 1849, by the Court of Common Pleas,* the doctrine was laid down in such terms, and under circumstances so similar, as almost to justify a suspicion that if the same law in the Cardinal's case had been adhered to, the action could not possibly have been maintained. The plaintiff in that case was a dissenting preacher, and he sued for words far stronger than in the present case, imputing downright dishonesty. The libel was written to a person who had acted for the plaintiff in the course of a correspondence arising out of an invitation to defendant by that person, with the plaintiff's concurrence, to investigate certain charges brought against the plaintiff. The court held the letter privileged. And Lord Chief Justice Wilde, (now Lord Truro,) said, in giving judgment, "The sole object of his communications with the defendant was to discuss the matter which the defendant had alleged against the plaintiff, with a view of establishing that the imputation against the plaintiff was unfounded, with the intention of the result being known to the congregation." The Court of Exchequer, when this idea was cited, distinguished it on two grounds; first, that in the Cardinal's case the plaintiff had not written the attack upon him in the *Ami*; and, secondly, that the Cardinal had published the answer to it in another newspaper, the *Univers*. If these distinctions are valid in law, they are not so either in justice or good sense, for how could it affect the Cardinal's right to defend himself, that the attack was or was not, (and how could he tell whether it was or was not,) written by the plaintiff? And how could he effectually defend himself from an attack in the press except by publication in the press? Added to which, in 1827 the Court of Common Pleas decided in a similar case,† where there had been a printed circular published—that the publication would have been privileged but for certain evidence of personal malice in the defendant. If, however, the decision in the Court of Exchequer was sound law, at least it was not sound sense, and that we may venture to say, because we know

* *Hopwood v. Thorn*, 19 Law Journal, C. P. 94.

† *Blackburn v. Blackburn*, 4 Bing. 395.

that the courts of law in this country have been of late years much divided and perplexed by questions of privilege in actions of libel, and next, because in this very case Mr. Boyle having sued the *Univers* in the French courts, they decided *against* the action, upon the very ground mainly urged by the Cardinal in the English courts, that the circumstances negatived that presumption of malice, without which the action for libel cannot be maintained. It is not one of the least interesting features of this remarkable cause, that it should thus have brought into opposition the courts of England and of France, on a question of law of great social and moral importance. And the full significance of the fact would not be appreciated unless it were observed that the French law, as it is obviously in accordance with justice and common sense, is also in accordance with the moral theology of the Catholic Church, which formed the basis of the common law in all Christian countries anterior to the Reformation, and with which the law of England, before that event, was, to a far greater extent than it is now, in accordance.*

Well, the cause came down for a third trial at the Surrey summer assizes before Mr. Justice Wightman at Croydon. Either before that learned and experienced judge, or before his colleague in the commission, Mr. Justice Creswell, both clear-headed and impartially minded men, the plaintiff's counsel saw that there was no chance of "snatching a verdict;" and as their case, as respected proof of publication, was so bad, as to render any chance of success except by such means utterly hopeless—proposals for a compromise—thrown out after the rule for a new trial had been granted, were renewed. Anxious as the Cardinal's advisers were to spare him the annoyance of any further litigation, they, nevertheless, could not consent to

* Before the Reformation actions for defamation were either of spiritual cognizance, or at all events from whatever cause, so unknown, that we believe no instance can be detected of such an action. After the Reformation the Courts were speedily flooded with such actions. This is one of the most remarkable facts in our history; and what follows from it is very important, that the law as to defamation is pure Protestant law. Is that the reason it is so monstrously inconsistent with justice and common sense, and still more with Christianity?

by compromise of the action, or of the cause of complaint, because they felt that he had not been guilty of that of which Baron Platt coarsely and cruelly accused him, of publishing a false and malicious libel. False it was not, except in particulars as to which, either it had been published in a form in which he had not written it, or in an immaterial point in which he had been misled by his assistant; and malicious it was not at all, as it was written for the purpose of a just and necessary vindication. His advisers, therefore, declined to accede to any verdict for damages, however small,—not even forty shillings, or a farthing. They also declined to adopt any kind of apology or retraction. It was pressed upon them that the plaintiff had by his three failures been put to enormous expense, and although there had been a subscription amongst some zealous Protestants, yet it may be assumed that the funds had proved insufficient, and that the chance of success diminished, the subscribers were not disposed to contribute. It was represented to the Cardinal's advisers, that though he did not write the libel printed, and had actually directed a correction of the very error of importance, yet that it had been published, and was in one respect—that referred to—untrue; and it was urged that he might, at all events, pay a portion of the costs. This was assented to. And the consequence was, that when for the last time a Protestant jury were about to be empannelled to try the case of *Wiseman v. Boyle*, they were doomed to be utterly disappointed; without a word being said, the record was withdrawn, and they were torn in the next case; with looks of blank surprise and baffled spite. Such was the "lame and impotent conclusion" of the cause in a *legal* point of view. Practically, as the Cardinal of course will have to pay his own costs, in addition to that portion of the plaintiff's which his advisers had engaged to pay, the probability is that the champions of moderate Catholicism, aided by Protestant zeal, will have succeeded in inflicting upon the Cardinal Archbishop, in addition to a twelvemonth's annoyance, a fine not far short of the sum for which the impartial Surrey jury returned their verdict. The *money* may be replaced; the wear and tear of mind, the worry of spirit, and the keen sense of unkindness, injustice, and wrong, are not so easily compensated. Nor will any who heard ever forget the speeches of the plaintiff's counsel, nor the contumely and obloquy

which the advocate of a Catholic Priest was instructed to heap upon an illustrious Catholic Prelate. But morally what is the result and aspect of the case? Setting aside its exposure of the infirmity of English Judges, the partiality of English juries, and the iniquity of English Law, what does the issue of the case show? The plaintiff's counsel represented the client as the champion of the moderate English Catholics, suffering for their opposition to the extreme views of the "ultramontane" party, headed by the Cardinal. Well, this was the battle field of that moderate party, if there is such a party, which the plaintiff instructed his counsel to make. The assailants chose the field; they selected the weapons; they entrapped the Cardinal by a newspaper attack into a newspaper defence. And then they challenged him in an action for libel, mainly upon the strength of a mistake for which he was not responsible, and which he had promptly corrected. They narrowed their cause to a miserably small issue. They made in each successive encounter a miserably small muster, they met ultimately with a miserable discomfiture. They snatched a verdict for once by evidence which was contradicted by numerous affidavits. They had declared that the clergy of England disapproved of the Hierarchy, and were not friendly to its head: but only three clerical assailants came forward—the plaintiff, and his two witnesses, Mr. Ivers, and one other priest from a different diocese. The question in substance was whether these priests and the letters in the *Ami* represented the Catholic clergy of England; and the history and issue of the cause showed clearly that they did not. This was the question which the Cardinal originally came forward to settle. Like all men who have the courage to stand forth in defence of a great cause he has suffered, but he has succeeded.

Moreover, it has been made manifest that the real cause of the action was the removal from Islington. That was what the plaintiff's counsel harped upon in his truculent speeches at Guildford and at Kingston. That was what the calm one-sided Baron Platt dwelt upon with so much bitterness, until reminded that it had nothing to do with the case. That was what the jury gave damages for; libel was so unsubstantial that it could only call for nominal damages. So well was this understood, that the moment the court of Exchequer declared that damages could be

account be given for the *removal*, the plaintiff's counsel prepared to relinquish the action. Then it was not really an action for libel. Practically it was an action for the *removal*; and it is in this point of view that the action is of the deepest moral and historical interest. In ecclesiastical history it will have a melancholy distinction. It is, we believe, as the Editor of the *Weekly Register* remarked, the first instance of an action by a priest against his Bishop, for an act in the discharge of his spiritual and pastoral duty. That the removal from Islington was such an act who can question? Rightly or wrongly, it was done by the then Vicar Apostolic, as the Pastor and Bishop of the Diocese, and it was an act which related to the *pastorship* of a particular parish or chapel. Then the action was brought against the Bishop for a letter in which he had explained and vindicated the reasons for the removal. It is immaterial whose was the attack upon him which called for the explanation. It is enough that it was called for. It was given, and justly given. It was made the technical ground of an action for libel; in which the real complaint was as to the removal. This was then an action by an assistant-Priest or Curate, who could not possibly have canonical rights (even had canon law been established) against his Bishop, for removing him from a mission from which the senior priest had already been removed, for reasons he had well and wisely acquiesced in. Whatever the merits of the action, however, it was the first of its kind, and we hope it will be the last. The long annals of the Church present, we believe, no instance of such an action as the suit of a priest against his bishop for removing him from a mission, more especially after a submission and professed reconciliation. Is a secular tribunal under any circumstances to be resorted to by a priest in such a case? This is a grave question, to which, surely, there can be but one answer. There can be little doubt that the action would never have been brought, but under Protestant persuasions. That the removal was rightful the plaintiff had already acknowledged by his submission. If it were not so, or if the Cardinal's letter were wrongful, there was an appeal open to the Holy See. And as regards the letter, the fair and proper course even for a man indisposed to abide by a spiritual tribunal's decision was—to reply to the letter in the press. But no: an action was brought, of which of course the result could

not be otherwise than vexation and expense.—Was it brought for that? If so, it has certainly succeeded; and the Protestant subscribers and Catholic sympathizers have had something for their money. They have inflicted great annoyance and a heavy fine upon a Catholic Prelate. But there are successes which bring no consolation, and win no honour.

For a Priest to have resisted removal on the score of claims for “compensation,” which he refused to refer to the arbitrament of brother-priests, and then to have sued his Bishop, and made the gist of his complaint that removal, is surely something not to be recalled by any priest without regret; while as to the Bishop, it certainly may be regarded, with or without reference to the merits of the case, as more or less a case of suffering for the integrity and sanctity of his high office. If Bishops are to be assailed with virulent attacks for removing priests, or by expensive law-suits for answering such attacks by explanations of the grounds of removal—the Pastoral office will be exercised under terror of the secular law, and their priests regarded as their future prosecutors. Is this a state of things which any Catholic can contemplate without pain? Yet that was the state of things to which this action tended to conduct us, had it not been manfully and successfully resisted. For that resistance, surely the Cardinal Archbishop will receive, among good Catholics, loyal and dutiful sympathy.

ART. VI.—*Allocuzione della Santità di Nostro Signore Pio PP. IX. Al sacro Collegio vel Consistoro Segreto dei 22. Gennajo 1855. Seguita da una Esposizione Corredata di documenti sulle incessanti Cure della Stessa Santità Sua a Riparo dei Gravi mali da cui è afflitta la Chiesa Cattolica nel Regno di Sardegna. Roma, 1855.*

WE are constantly told that the British nation must look with the deepest interest and sympathy on the Sardinian States, because in that country a constitutional

system, based on the principles of our own, has stood the shock of those convulsions which have proved fatal to other polities of like nature in our time, and is now being worked with at least some outward show of success. This view is perfectly natural in a country like ours which takes great pride in its national institutions, and boasts that they are the envy of surrounding nations. We do not wish to interfere with feelings so patriotic and gratifying with reference to Sardinia. But at the same time we ask our readers to take a nearer and a more practical view of men and affairs in that country in order to see what is the real working of that piece of political machinery which shows so fair in the columns of newspapers, and in the speeches of Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell. And, as the entire subject would exceed our limits, we will confine ourselves to the ecclesiastical affairs of the States of the House of Savoy, and their relation with the Holy See. This branch of Sardinian politics will give a solution to several difficult questions and illustrate divers interesting matters regarding the working of constitutional governments;—and its investigation will place in a true light affairs and events of the highest religious and political importance, which prejudice and falsehood have distorted and misrepresented.

We must in the first place advert to two notions rooted in public opinion here, and supported even by statesmen in both Houses of Parliament. The first is, that in the Sardinian States a “Protestant Reformation” is going on, and that that country is becoming Protestant: and the second is that the body of the nation, headed by its king and its parliament, are engaged in a struggle for independence against the Holy See, and against the clergy of the Catholic Church. Both these propositions are totally false.

With regard to the first,—any one acquainted with the country must know that the mass of the nation is thoroughly Catholic, and that Protestantism is contrary to the spirit and disposition of the people. Much has no doubt been done by the government to shake their religious sentiments, and to detach the rising generation from the Church of their fathers. The present prime minister, Count de Cavour, is naturally favourable to a Protestant propagandism, because his mother was a Genevese Calvinist. He has moreover imbibed the English notion that

constitutional liberty cannot flourish except hand in hand with Protestantism ; and we shall see that the position of his administration as well as of that of some of his predecessors naturally placed the ministry in a state of hostility towards the Church. His principal colleague, Rattazzi, is a man bred in the secret societies, thoroughly imbued with their principles and intrigues, and raised from obscurity by the influence of those detestable associations. The consequence is, that the influence of the government is against the Catholic Church. Thus, a system of public education has been established on the purely secular plan,—an irreligious press has been encouraged or tacitly allowed to corrupt the minds of the people, and the Universities of Genoa and Turin have been reduced to a low condition by the promotion to professorships of partizans of the government, mostly refugees, without learning or talent, but fully prepared to encourage latitudinarianism and infidelity. The effect of all this on the rising generation is terrible, and calculated to sow the seeds of future revolution and anarchy. But it would be a mistake to suppose that the tendency of things is toward Protestantism. It is in the direction of infidelity and the secret societies. And Protestantism does not thrive. In Piedmont the new sect is not numerous, and it is divided into two denominations, each of them represented by a newspaper, and they violently abuse and denounce each other. At Genoa no person of any ability or character, or station, has joined the Protestant ranks, and at the time when the cholera broke out, many returned to the true Church. It is, indeed, notorious that the “Evangelical” Chapel cannot be filled without distributions of money among the congregation. And on one occasion when the bag was empty, they made a disturbance and broke the benches because the usual supply of “*motte*,” or 4d. pieces, was not forthcoming. The Bible Societies have, it is true, been at work, but their Protestant Bibles are, for the most part, sold for waste paper, or exported again, or delivered up to the clergy. These facts shew that the favourite English idea of the rapid increase of Protestantism in the Sardinian States is a delusion, which however it suits the interest of many people diligently to keep alive.

We come now to the second of the two propositions stated above. The hostility of the majority in the

Chamber of Deputies against the Church would at first sight seem to support the idea that the nation is also opposed to the Church. But the fact is, that the Chamber does not represent the opinions of the nation. It is packed, and also under the direct influence of the ministry. A system of jobbing with small places, pensions, and decorations all over the country, influences the constituencies, and the secret service money is also used for the same purposes. To these electioneering means in the hands of the executive, we must add one important circumstance.

The government have in their *employés* the machinery of electioneering always ready. And it can easily be brought to bear when there is need. Thus we could mention a case where the gendarmerie were sent round to canvass the voters for the ministerial candidate, and the Syndic or mayor was required to tell them that they must vote for him. But those who really represent the opinions of the majority have no such appliances and means. In a country new to constitutional government, people do not know how to oppose the government, and they fear to do so. They neglect the registry, and then they are unwilling to go to the poll. The consequence in the case adverted to above, was that the Catholic candidate who really had the majority with him, was beaten, because he could not get his men to the poll. Thus the result of the elections is, under the circumstances just described, in reality no test of the opinions of the people. Late events at Genoa corroborate and illustrate these statements. The experiment has been tried of bringing into play in that city a proper system and machinery for the management of the registry and of elections on the side of the Catholic party. The result is, that they have returned fourteen members of the town council, while the ministry have only seven. This trial of strength shows what may be done. Similar results have been obtained in like manner at Chambery, and in other places. And as the same constituency elects the members of the Chamber of Deputies, it is evident that when the majority have sufficient fair play, a different sort of Chamber will be returned, really representing the feelings and principles of the nation. And in the meanwhile we may safely say that if the majority of the present Chamber are more or less undutifully disposed towards the Church, it does not follow that the nation is of the same way of thinking, which, indeed,

any one well acquainted with the country must know not to be the case. We may admit that the ministry, and a packed Chamber of Deputies, are carrying on a struggle with the Church and the Holy See, but we deny that the nation is a party to this unholy war. This important distinction will appear more and more as we proceed. It is absolutely necessary that we should state it clearly and positively before entering on the examination of the various steps which have led the Sardinian government to its present lamentable position with regard to the Catholic Church.

Another preliminary matter remains to be dealt with. It is the key to a great part of the subject on which we are going to enter.

A chief point in the policy of the men who have held office since the abdication of King Charles Albert, has been hostility to the Church. Practical statesmen have observed, that to quarrel with the Church is a false step—*un grande maladresse*. And so it is; for the Emperor Napoleon I. observed, after the experience acquired by himself, that the Pope ought always to be treated as a prince who has an army of a hundred thousand men. And history shows that those who have quarrelled with the Catholic Church, have generally in the end suffered for it. Politicians attribute this to the working of a wonderful organisation, which they cannot help admiring as a great fact in the government of the world, and which they describe as a masterpiece of human wisdom: while Catholics see that such results, continued beyond the period of the duration of any civil constitution, are the work of that perennial Providence which God Himself promised to His Church. Why then did shrewd men like Azeglio, Siccardi, Rattazzi, Cavour, &c., commit the blunder of bringing the civil power into collision with the Church? The answer to this question is very important.

The time of disappointment, bitterness, and agitation which succeeded the defeat of the Sardinian armies, and the abdication of the king, naturally brought to power men who would not have held it without those exceptional and revolutionary circumstances. When the public mind became calmer, they found it difficult to maintain their position, against the wishes of a great body of the people, and those of the nobility and the clergy of the Established Church. These two important classes were intimately

attached to each other, and very formidable to the views of the men in power. The ministerial party, therefore, naturally resorted to the expedient of trying to raise an agitation against the clergy and the nobility, to weaken their influence, and so strengthen themselves. This they did at first by means of the press, and then by political measures, calculated at the same time to make the Church unpopular, and to deprive her of property and power. The refugees, who had been thrown by circumstances on the soil of Piedmont, were also an element in this anti-ecclesiastical movement. They were for the most part men of extreme opinions and desperate fortunes, and many of them, affiliated to the secret societies, who are the sworn enemies of religion and order. These men were pensioned, and down to the present time they have been successful candidates for public employments and offices. They introduced, or at least greatly augmented and spread those secret societies, whose formidable organisation is ever directed to the injury of Christianity, and especially of the Catholic Church. We have already stated that Rattazzi was bred in these societies—raised by their intrigue, and saturated with their detestable principles. Siccardi is a man of the same class, and many other leaders of that party are included in those mysterious affiliations which are the principal danger and pest of Italy, even at the present moment. It was natural that the members of cabinets placed under the circumstances to which we have referred, should be bad churchmen, and desirous of injuring the Church, both from motives of party policy and from animosity and revenge. Some of them also thought that the Catholic Church, with its strong organisation and flexible principles, was not so favourable to the progress of civil liberty as Protestantism. This is the view of a man of the world, who has a notion that England would never have been the free country that it is without Protestantism. And so he has acquired a good deal of sympathy and popularity in this country. Perhaps some of these men thought that they could quietly undermine the Church without causing a collision; but when once the struggle commenced, it was difficult to stop, and the ministers soon undertook a regular campaign against the Church and the Holy See. Hence arose the Siccardi Law, and from the proceedings on that measure came the persecution of Monsignore Franzoni, Archbishop of Turin. The country was

dragged gradually into its present false and dangerous position with regard to the Holy See, by the cunning manoeuvres of the ministers and the machinations of the secret societies. And the weakness of the king, and the inexperience and indolence of the people, who had neither the knowledge and skill, nor the energy to cope with the electioneering and jobbing of the government, rendered the Chamber of Deputies the tool of ambitious unscrupulous party men.

This explanation shows the groundlessness of the opinion so popular in this country, that a national movement against the Catholic Church is going on in the Sardinian states, and that Messrs. Cavour and Rattazzi are the exponents of the national will.

We will now proceed to lay before our readers the true history of those transactions, so misrepresented and misunderstood in this country, which have brought Sardinia into collision with the Holy See, and sowed the seeds of future disorder and revolution in Italy. And we have no hesitation in declaring our belief that even our Protestant readers, who wish to see a schism in Italy, will condemn the policy of the Sardinian government as dishonest, unstatesmanlike, unconstitutional, and calculated to inflict irretrievable injuries on the country committed to their charge.

We have before us a MS. statement, emanating from a very high personage, which shows that even when the Pope retired to Gaeta the Sardinian government entertained a decided hostility against the Holy See. After His Holiness had left Rome, on the 24th Nov., 1848, he addressed a letter, dated in December of that year, to all the governments in Europe, stating the measures which had induced him to abandon his capital and dominions. All the Catholic states, with one exception, returned answers conceived in the most dutiful terms, and Spain took the initiative in proposing to maintain by arms the temporal power of the Holy See in the Roman States. The exception was Sardinia, which protested against that proposal. And that protest was repeated when the other Catholic powers, with the approbation even of Protestant England, declared their intention of restoring the Pope to his throne. This is not difficult to be explained, for the MS. above referred to, hints at certain intrigues carried on by the Sardinian government at Rome after the deposition of the

Pope,—the object of which was to bring about a union of the Roman States with Piedmont. And things were carried so far that a Piedmontese minister addressed the people from his balcony at Rome, and the Sardinian flag was placed on the Antonine column and in the hands of the equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius at the Capitol. The failure of the project was no doubt a great disappointment, which had an influence over subsequent transactions between the Holy See and the Sardinian government. We will only add two facts regarding this intrigue. They are these:—Count Montezemolo with an ecclesiastic attached to the Court, were sent from Turin to Gaeta for the purpose of persuading the Pope to take up his residence in the Sardinian States—at Savona, a little town near Genoa, where His Holiness would have been completely in the power of the cabinet of Turin. And a second mission represented by Count Cæsar Balbo, endeavoured to induce the Pope to decide on not leaving a constitutional government to the States of the Church. That the cabinet of Turin should undertake such a task, can only be accounted for by supposing that the object was to lead the Pope to some step which might render his return to his dominions more difficult.

Here it is necessary to state a stratagem which forms an important part of the policy of the Sardinian ministers in all their transactions with the Holy See. They knew that an open direct act tending to a breach with the Holy See would be looked upon with disgust by the great body of the nation. They therefore professed much deference to Rome, and a wish to do nothing affecting the rights of the Church without obtaining by negotiations the consent of the Sovereign Pontiff. They declared that negotiations were proceeding with Rome at times when no negotiations whatever were being carried on. At other times their ambassador was not instructed to proceed with the business on which they publicly professed to have sent him; or he was instructed to make some preliminary demand which they knew could not be complied with. By these means the people were amused and deluded, and it was sought to produce an opinion, both at home and abroad, that with the Holy See compromise is impossible, and conciliation useless; and that Rome is utterly impracticable, deaf to argument, and regardless of those circumstances of time and place which render concessions in some cases reason-

able and wise. These dishonest tactics have proved to a considerable extent successful. A most unjust prejudice against the Court of Rome has been raised or increased, and the Sardinian people have been craftily led step by step into a position contrary to their religious convictions, and which is a scandal to Christendom. In England especially, an ample field has been opened for declamation and calumny. But we will continue our narrative.

While the Pope was at Portici, Counts Siccardi and Cesare Balbo were accredited to His Holiness for the professed object of obtaining a new concordat, settling various questions which since the establishment of the Sardinian constitution had arisen between the two courts. But instead of entering at once into those matters, they demanded the removal from their sees of the Archbishop of Turin and the Bishop of Asti. That was impossible because there was no canonical ground for the Pope to obtain the resignation of those prelates. The envoy must have known this from the very beginning; but on being told that what they asked could not be done, they returned to Turin, to the great disappointment of the Holy Father, who had hoped for a satisfactory conclusion of the intended concordat, and who also feared, lest the failure of the mission might produce an unfavourable effect on the mind of the young king, Victor Emanuel. His Holiness accordingly sent to the king Monsignore Charvaz, the present Archbishop of Genoa, at that time Bishop of Sebaste, with apostolic letters, and commissioned to declare to His Majesty the benevolent feelings of the Pope towards his royal person and the people of his dominions, and to explain the Apostolic duty obliging His Holiness to reject the request made to him to induce the Prelates of Turin and Asti to resign. The king, in reply to these communications, assured the Pope that he would give his royal protection to the two prelates; promising that a bill should immediately be proposed to the Chambers, regarding public education, in which the rights of the Bishops should be recognized, and that the negotiations for the concordat should be renewed; and His Majesty showed to the papal envoy a bill regarding the press; containing provisions calculated to restrain its licentiousness. But notwithstanding these assurances and promises of the king, and at the same time, that is to say at the end of 1849 and the commencement of the following year,

great acts of violence were committed by the government against the Archbishop of Cagliari who had thought it his duty not to submit to the demands of a commission appointed to prepare a measure for the abolition of tithes. And on the 2nd of January, the revenues of the Archbishopric were seized by the Crown. And on the 25th of February the famous Siccardi law was proposed to the Chamber of Deputies. To that measure we must now direct our attention.

Siccardi's bill was framed to abolish the ecclesiastical jurisdictions and suppress the observance of certain religious festivals. Those provisions of the bill were a direct violation of the concordat, solemnly signed by the Pope and the king in 1841, as well as of other preceding treaties of the same nature.* The ministers attempted to justify themselves to the Papal Nuncio and Cardinal Antonelli, the Pro-secretary of State, by stating that they had been compelled to bring in the Bill; that the negotiations repeatedly commenced with the Holy See had always been unsuccessful; and that it was best for the government to take the initiative rather than leave it to the parliament to do so. They added that they were willing to enter into negotiations with the Holy See on the matters contained in the Bill, provided such negotiations were carried on at Turin, and *provided that the determination taken by the government should be accepted as immutable.* The iniquity of these reasons and proposals is obvious. The breach of a solemn treaty is justified on a supposed ground of necessity, which amounts to no more than a determination on the part of the ministers to do anything rather than resign their places. As for the alleged fruitlessness of the negotiations, it arose, not on the part of the Holy See, but on that of the Sardinian Government. Cardinal Antonelli, in a note dated 9 March, 1850, pointed out to the Sardinian Minister, that in 1848 the Pope had appointed a plenipotentiary, who had taken cognizance of the proposals of the Sardinian Minister, and presented his observations thereon, but the Sardinian Government proceeded no further, and let the matter drop. The Cardinal added that though Count Siccardi had presented credentials on his mission to Portici, contain-

* 1741, 1742, 1747, 1836, 1841.

ing among other reasons for which he was sent, the matters to which the Siccardi law related, yet it was a fact that he never commenced any negotiation regarding them, but declared that he had received instructions to return to Turin, and no communication whatever on the subject was subsequently made to the Court of Rome. It is clear therefore, that though the Court of Turin made a proposal in 1848, to that of Rome, the former never had entered into any negotiation on the subjects contained in Siccardi's bill. Yet the Marquis d'Azeglio and his colleagues made people believe both at home and abroad that the government had proposed the Siccardi bill after repeated endeavours to obtain concessions from Rome and finding the Holy See thoroughly impracticable. It certainly was believed in this country that Count Siccardi had carried on a negotiation with the Pope, preparatory to the introduction of his bill. But we have seen that he only asked the removal of two bishops. This is an instance of the stratagem of pretended negotiations to which we have already adverted.

When in spite of the remonstrances of the nuncio and Cardinal Pro-secretary of State, the bill received the royal assent on the 9th of April, 1850, the nuncio by command of His Holiness quitted Turin. And then followed other acts of violence and hostility against the Church, to which we shall in due time advert.

The Marquis d'Azeglio, prime minister of the king of Sardinia, now started a new and astonishing argument in support of the Siccardi law. He maintained that it was competent and just for the parliament and crown of Sardinia to pass that law, although it was a violation of the concordats with Rome, because as every country has a right to alter its internal institutions and laws, it follows that a concordat with Rome must be held binding only in a qualified way, that is to say, subject to that right of the state, and *rebus sic stantibus*, that is to say, provided the laws of the country remain as they were at the time when the concordat was concluded. And he laid it down that as the constitution declared all men equal in the eye of the law, the exceptional jurisdiction of the spiritual courts over the clergy must be held to be contrary to the constitution, and the concordat confirming that privilege, no longer in force. He forgot that the same constitution declared the Catholic religion to be the only religion of the

state, and must, therefore, be held to confirm its legal privileges and discipline. And it is moreover difficult to see why the ecclesiastical courts are more contrary to the equality of citizens than courts military and the jurisdiction of the upper house of parliament. The Marquis d'Azeglio, however, cited a passage from Wheaton's International Law, which says that treaties expire when the internal constitution of government of either state is so changed as to render the treaty inapplicable under circumstances different from those with a view to which it was concluded. But the Marquis chose to omit the very next paragraph which shews that the doctrine of Wheaton is beside the question, for it applies only to *personal* treaties, and not to *real* treaties, which are binding on the contracting powers, independently of any change of the sovereignty or in the rulers of the state.*

It is evident that the doctrine of the Piedmontese minister, that the concordat could not preclude them from making any alteration of their laws, though such alterations were contrary to its stipulations, must make every concordat a mere delusion, for it means in substance that a concordat is a contract binding on one of the parties so long only as he chooses to be bound, and no longer. It is difficult to imagine a more fraudulent delusion. A state may indeed say, I will not enter into any treaty restraining my power or free action in my own internal affairs. But if such a treaty be entered into, will it not be binding? Let us suppose that Naples or Tuscany engaged by treaty with England to allow the public celebration of Protestant worship within their territories, could they argue that this treaty did not preclude them from making Protestant worship illegal? Could they maintain this on the ground that a treaty must not interfere with their internal legislation? If such a principle be admitted, it will make a great innovation in the public law of Europe, and invalidate many important treaties. For instance: treaties of commerce frequently contain stipulations restricting the power of a government to tax its own subjects. But it is needless to multiply examples for the purpose of showing that the principle contended for on the part of Sardinia is utterly at variance

* Wheaton, vol. i. p. 299.

with the fundamental rules of jurisprudence regarding treaties.

A recent writer in the "Quarterly Review" has dealt with this subject ingeniously, but most unsoundly. He admits that the Roman doctrine (as he terms it) respecting the obligation of the civil power to observe a concordat as if it were an international treaty, is supported by the form of the instrument itself, which is that of a treaty between two powers, entered into by means of plenipotentiaries in the usual way. But he contends that a concordat is a treaty between the sovereign of one country and that of another in matters regarding the subjects of one of them, and that therefore it is of an anomalous description, and not absolutely binding like other treaties. He supposes that the power of the Pope to enter into these compacts depends on his political character as a temporal sovereign; and alleges that if the Pope lost his temporal power, a concordat must cease to be international. But if it did cease to be international, would it on that account be no longer binding? Is no public contract obligatory on a state which has entered into it, unless it be international? Such a proposition is glaringly false. Suppose a foreign government to agree with Messrs. Rothschild that, in consideration of a loan, it will not repeal a particular impost. That agreement would not be international, though entered into with a foreigner, but to repeal the impost would be a breach of faith and a dishonest act.

But the truth is, that the public law of Europe has recognised in the Sovereign Pontiff a mixed character, namely, that of the Supreme Head of the Roman Catholic Church, and at the same time sovereign of the Roman States. As a sovereign prince he is one of the crowned heads of Europe with all the rights of other sovereigns. As Head of the Church he is also sovereign and supreme. In both these characters the Pope is undeniably capable of entering into treaties with sovereign powers. Whether a concordat with the Holy See be international, is a matter wholly immaterial. It is a solemn public contract, which cannot be violated without subverting public faith. It is not indeed a treaty between an Italian sovereign and a foreign power, regarding internal affairs of that foreign power, but a compact between the Sovereign Pontiff, the Supreme Head of the Catholic Church, and a temporal government, regarding matters within the jurisdiction of —

the Holy See. And accordingly, by a concordat, the Holy See usually grants to the temporal government privileges and powers which the Holy See alone can grant—such, for instance, as the nomination to bishoprics and the like. But no one who is not grossly ignorant of history and public law, can deny that these contracts are universally recognised as equally binding with the treaties between temporal sovereign powers.

But the “Quarterly Review” supposes that the Holy See claims the right of violating a concordat at pleasure, thus holding it to be binding only on the part of the temporal government. Nothing can be more utterly groundless than this notion. The Holy See has always most scrupulously observed the provisions of every concordat according to their true meaning and construction. To say the contrary, is either an instance of gross ignorance, or a dishonest pretence, to bolster up a breach of faith by means of calumny.

We must of course cast aside the theory, popular in this country, which treats the Holy See as a “foreign power,” and maintains that every state has a right to manage all matters within its territory, whether civil or ecclesiastical, without the intervention of any authority external to that territory. The Holy See is *nowhere a foreign power*, because everywhere it is the Head of the Catholic Church, and as such it is indigenous to every country in the world, though the Pope is also a sovereign prince governing an Italian state. We do not enter into the theological part of the question. It is sufficient here to say that the doctrine of separate national Churches subject only to the temporal power, is a Protestant doctrine. The Supreme Leadership of the Pope as Vicar of Christ is *de fide* in the Catholic Church. Wherever the Catholic Church is established, recognised, or tolerated, that doctrine must be established, recognised, or tolerated also. And it necessarily involves a jurisdiction of the Holy See in spiritual and ecclesiastical matters, beyond the limits of the Roman States, and extending over the Catholic Church in every part of the world. On this ground it was that Mr. Canning argued in favour of a concordat between the British crown and the Holy See. He knew that the jurisdiction of the Pope over the Catholic Church in this country was a fact which no reasonable man could deny, and which must be tolerated because the Church is

tolerated ; and that if any concessions from that Church were to be obtained, they could only come from Rome by means of negotiation and treaty. Now the states of the King of Sardinia are a Roman Catholic country, in which the Roman Catholic religion and Church are established by the temporal law. It follows that the common notion existing here—that the Sardinian government is to exclude the Pope from all interference with the Church in that country, is simply an absurdity. It is inconsistent with the article of the constitution, which declares the Roman Catholic religion to be the only religion of the state. And it was most ably argued by Cardinal Antonelli, that even independently of the concordat, the state could not, without the assent of the Holy See, constitutionally make any alteration in the laws affecting ecclesiastical discipline, because that article of the constitution implicitly acknowledges the divine right of the Pope as Supreme Head and Ruler of the Catholic Church, and he is the sole competent judge of the modifications or other changes which ecclesiastical discipline may from time to time require.

We cannot enter into an examination of the Siccardi Law, which would exceed our limits, but something must be said on the strange notions prevailing here and elsewhere regarding the privileges which that law abolished.

The notion propagated here and elsewhere by the friends of the Sardinian government is, that until the passing of Siccardi's law, the clergy were exempt from the jurisdiction of the temporal courts ; that they set the laws of the land at defiance, and that by this state of things they were enabled to commit the most atrocious crimes with something very like impunity. But this is utterly false. Papers laid before parliament in 1816,* shew that even at that time ecclesiastics in Sardinia, Piedmont, and Savoy, were liable to trial before the secular courts for all serious offences ; that laymen were independent of the ecclesiastical courts, except in questions of faith, when the punishments were purely spiritual, and in cases of bigamy, where the sentences were executed by the secular power ; and that the clergy were amenable to the secular courts in almost all civil causes, and

* Appendix, No. vii., to report from Committee on Regulation of Catholics in foreign countries, 1816.

wherever the defendant was a layman. Further concessions were subsequently made by the Holy See, and at the time when Siccardi brought in his bill, the ecclesiastical jurisdiction in Piedmont was considerably less in extent and power than that which exists in England. But the government were determined to make a grievance when none existed, for the purpose of carrying on their insidious policy against the Church.

It may perhaps be said that the court of Rome should not have declined to treat after the bill had been brought before the Chamber. But it would have been absurd to attempt to enter into fresh arrangements with a government which deliberately denied the obligation of all former treaties, and declared that the bill, admitted to be a violation of five concordats, should be proceeded with, whatever might be the results of the proposed negociation. We will now consider a matter directly arising out of the facts already stated.

In the course of the proceedings by which the concordat with the Holy See was broken in defiance of public faith, and the rights of the Established Church secured by that solemn compact violated and destroyed, the Archbishop of Turin issued a pastoral letter, animadverting against the measures of the government. The Archbishop was a man of mild disposition, great piety, and simple habits. His pastoral was conceived in terms which, in this country, would certainly not have been considered to exceed the limits of constitutional freedom. They were scarcely so strong as the language repeatedly used by a distinguished member of the Bench of the Protestant establishment in this country. But in Piedmont, where the press daily poured forth invectives against the Church, the clergy, and the nobility without attracting the notice of the Executive—the protestations and remonstrances of the Archbishop excited the immediate hostility of the Attorney-General. A prosecution, at the suit of the crown, was commenced. The principles of constitutional freedom, and the right of the subject to canvass government measures and attack ministers, were invoked. But a subservient jury gave way to the influence of the government and the threats of a mob, and convicted the Archbishop. He was condemned to fine and imprisonment, and suffered punishment accordingly. Proceedings of the same charac-

ter were also taken against the Archbishop of Sassari, in the island of Sardinia.

The Siccardi Law was passed, annulling a solemn contract between the Holy See and the crown. Men of honour and probity shrunk from this act of dishonesty. The Marquis of Brignole Sale, a man of the highest rank, who had grown grey in the performance of great public duties, and decidedly the first person among the Genoese nobility, resigned an embassy, because he would not serve under ministers who had broken faith and stained the honour of the crown. Others followed the example of that distinguished statesman.

Among the foremost promoters of the Siccardi Law was the Count Santa Rosa, one of the ministers, a very bitter partisan. Soon after the passing of the Siccardi Law he fell ill, and sent for a confessor. He was told by that confessor that he was a party to an act of dishonesty, and that he was affected by the ecclesiastical censures pronounced against violators of the rights of the Church. He was advised to declare his penitence. Fearing the blame of his friends, he refused. The Archbishop was applied to. He gave the only answer he could give under the circumstances, namely, that the sick man could not receive absolution unless he declared his repentance. As a necessary consequence, he could not receive the last sacrament. Protestants will perhaps exclaim, that here the Church interfered with politics, by calling a minister to account for a public act. But is it possible that what is a sin if done by a man in his private capacity, is not a sin if done in a public character? Is it a sin to violate a contract for the sale of a bale of cotton, and *not* a sin to break a contract to which the crown is a party? This was not a question of policy or statecraft, but—a matter of right and wrong—of morals and of justice. How could a priest who had refused the sacraments to a tradesman because he would not repent of cheating a customer, absolve an impenitent minister who had advised the crown to break a contract with the Holy See? Besides, the minister was subject to censures as a violator of the rights of the Church. Those censures were indeed part and parcel of the law of the land: and in fact, the Archbishop only performed his strict and imperative duty, by directing the priest to refuse absolution unless the sick man declared repentance. We believe Santa Rosa would have

complied if he had not been surrounded by his political friends, who, for the sake of their own consistency and credit, exhorted him to be firm, and not to give way to the dictates of his conscience; and so the unfortunate man died impenitent. This lamentable event naturally produced the deepest sensation. The agents of the secret societies, and the friends of the ministers, stirred up the mob against the Archbishop. They made the ignorant people believe that the prelate was in communication with the Austrians. A tumult was thus raised under the windows of the archiepiscopal residence, and then the quondam colleagues of Santa Rosa, under pretence that the Archbishop was in danger, arrested him, and imprisoned him in the citadel. His papers were seized and placed before the law officers of the crown, and in a few days he was sent to the fortress called Fenestrelle, a prison, or rather a dungeon, on the top of a desert mountain in Savoy. All this was done without colour of legal right, and without any charge being brought against the Archbishop. No legal offence was alleged to have been committed by him. He was arrested and committed to a fortress, and then to another, where he was kept a close prisoner, without any legal process whatever. All his papers were seized and placed in the hands of the law officers, who were instructed to find out and frame some charge against him if they could.

In the meantime, the priest who had attended Santa Rosa was also arrested. He pleaded his ecclesiastical duty and the commands of his superior. If the Archbishop was to blame, at least the priest was innocent, for he had no choice. He could not disobey his Bishop in a strictly ecclesiastical matter. He had, moreover, committed no offence against the temporal laws. Even in England, an action does not lie against a Protestant clergyman for refusing to administer the Sacrament. The priest had not broken any law; he could not, therefore, be brought to trial: but he could be punished. Under pretence of satisfying the people, the government exiled him. He was a member of a college, who performed parochial duty. The property of the college was confiscated, and the members exiled. All this was by the arbitrary act of the executive, without any judicial proceeding and without legal warrant. Yet we are told that Sardinia is the

model constitutional country, which is treading in the steps of England!

Supposing for a moment that a Fellow of a college at Oxford refused to administer the Protestant Sacrament to some popular leader. What would the country say if the government seized and confiscated the property of the college, and exiled all the Fellows? Yet this was done at Turin, and Englishmen applauded the act! It was ingeniously dressed up and coloured, so that our countrymen mistook lawless oppression, injustice, and robbery, for an act of salutary and honourable severity.

In the meanwhile the Archbishop was a prisoner in the fortress of Fenestrelle. A most rigorous search at his house showed that there was not a shadow of pretence that he was in communication with the Austrians. But the government felt that they must bring him to trial for something, or tacitly admit themselves to have been guilty of tyranny and injustice. His direction to the confessor was no offence against the law. In truth, his ecclesiastical duty left him no choice in the matter, which was clearly, by the law of the land, exclusively within the province of the spiritual authority. What, then, was to be done? The ingenuity of the crown lawyers found at last a solution of the difficulty. There was an ancient Piedmontese law, made in the days of absolutism, whereby any one who showed by his general conduct a disposition unfavourable to the government, or its measures, was guilty of a constructive offence, and subject to an arbitrary punishment. Under this law the Archbishop was indicted. He was not entitled to a trial by jury, and two of the judges were removed as not being sufficiently favourable to the ministry. It was well known that the Archbishop was, as we should say, in opposition to the ministry. His act in the case of Santa Rosa showed his view of the Siccardi law; and the case of the pastoral letter, for which he had undergone punishment, was again brought up against him. In his defence it was urged that the law under which he was accused was old and obsolete, and inconsistent with the principles of constitutional government, and that an indictment for a constructive offence was dangerous to the liberties of the subject, especially where, as in the present instance, there was no trial by jury. It was argued that for the pastoral letter the prisoner had already been punished, and that no man could,

without violating principles of jurisprudence recognised in all countries, be punished twice for the same offence. But the court, overawed by the influence of government and by the mob of Turin, found the Archbishop guilty, though by a small majority, and condemned him to exile, and confiscation of all his property. He has lived ever since at Lyons, where he is beloved and revered, and from whence he is able to do such acts as are necessary for the spiritual management of his diocese. But the liberal constitutional government of Sardinia, which professes the utmost regard for the liberty of the press and freedom of opinions and discussion, has by every means endeavoured to prevent the exiled prelate from publishing anything in defence of himself and the rights of his Church, within the dominions of the king of Sardinia.

In the meanwhile he has been denounced by the press in that country, and in England, as arrogant, rebellious, overbearing, and proud; whereas he was the victim of an arbitrary prosecution; and all who are acquainted with him know that though inflexible and firm in the maintenance of what his conscience dictates, he is one of the mildest and humblest, and most Christian of men.

The persecution of the Archbishops of Turin, Cagliari and Sassari, and other ecclesiastics, and the flagrant violation of the concordat, caused a deep feeling of indignation throughout the kingdom, and the government were strongly attacked in the senate. Then the keeper of the seals did not hesitate to state in that assembly that the government were carrying on negotiations with Rome, regarding the abolition of ecclesiastical privileges. This was false, and it was accordingly denied by the Roman official paper. But the false declaration of the minister naturally obtained greater circulation than the denial, and therefore tended to tranquilize the minds of the people.

As a further measure to calm the public indignation and scandal, the government sent in August, 1850, the Cavaliere Pinelli, as envoy extraordinary to Rome. The result of this mission was similar to that of preceding ones. It was hoped that the envoy would approach the Pontifical throne with offers and expressions of conciliation and reparation. But instead of this, he insisted on the strange doctrine, that a concordat could be violated at the will of the civil government,—disclaimed every notion

of compromise,—and asked the removal of the Archbishop of Turin from his metropolitan See.

It is evident that the court of Rome could not undertake to treat with a power who denied the obligatory force of treaties, and who had shown such an utter disregard for the rights of the Church ; but the Cardinal Pro-Secretary of State, nevertheless, held several private conferences with the Cavaliere Pinelli, who offered nothing in return for his demands. In the meantime the usual false reports were spread by the government,—that important treaties were being negotiated, and would soon be concluded with the Holy See. These reports were denied by Apostolic letters, directed to the Archbishop of Vercelli, in answer to enquiries made by that prelate and his suffragans. And on the departure of the Cavaliere Pinelli, His Holiness pronounced in the consistory an Apostolical allocution, in which, with that moderation and charity which became the Father of all Christians, he clearly stated the principal facts of this lamentable history.

Notwithstanding these paternal and solemn admonitions, the Piedmontese government continued their hostile policy against the Church. They brought in a bill to abolish tithes in the Island of Sardinia, without making any adequate provision for the clergy in lieu thereof, declaring at the same time in the senate, that no differences existed on the subject with the Holy See. This declaration was untrue like the preceding ones, and it was denied by the court of Rome. The law abolishing tithes was passed, and thus again the concordat was violated which guaranteed the property of the clergy. Notwithstanding this, and divers other attacks on the rights of the Church, the Pope in the month of September, of the same year, graciously received conciliatory overtures made by the king through the Abate Sopranis, and expressed his desire to treat for a new concordat, provided that the injuries done to the Church were repaired, and things impossible to be granted, not insisted on. So matters remained until the commencement of November, when Count de Sambuy arrived at Rome as envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary, with a dispatch from the Marquis d'Azeglio, stating that the object of his mission was to continue negotiations and to settle the differences with the Holy See. But at the same time the government declared in the chamber that the mission of Count de Sambuy implied

departure from the system of policy commenced by the minister Siccardi. The Pope, however, consented to the negotiations, and appointed Monsignore, now Cardinal Santucci, his plenipotentiary. That prelate began by pressing on the Count that it was necessary that the Sardinian government should recognize the inviolability of the concordats, because on this point depended the possibility of entering into negotiations for concluding any new concordat with that government. After considerable difficulties the pontifical plenipotentiary transmitted to the Count de Sambuy, a proposed preamble to the intended treaty, stating that the concordats between the Holy See and the Sardinian government require modifications, and that for that purpose the intervention of the Holy See was necessary. But in consequence of difficulties on the part of the Piedmontese plenipotentiary, a second preamble was proposed by Monsignor Santucci. It reserved the provisions of the sacred canons and the concordats, declaring that they should remain in force until altered with the consent of the Holy See; and it consented that all causes purely civil affecting ecclesiastical persons, (excluding certain cases of ecclesiastical patronage,) should go to the lay courts; that the same courts should take cognizance of prosecutions against ecclesiastical persons for all offences whatsoever, except those regarding religion, and excepting those against bishops; and that all persons accused of any offence might be taken out of the sanctuaries, (which were very few and practically of no effect,) after certain formalities to be determined. These concessions were obviously very great, and they undeniably showed the desire of the Holy See to settle in a liberal spirit the differences with the court of Turin. But notwithstanding these liberal offers, and the repeated applications of the Pontifical plenipotentiary, the negotiations remained suspended until the 1st of August, during a period of six months. In the mean time various measures hostile to the Church were carried into effect by the government at Turin. In the course of the conferences, the Count de Sambuy declared that he did not propose to treat on the subject of the intended law on marriage, because the government intended to avoid touching the *vinculum* of matrimony and matrimonial causes stated by the Council of Trent as exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Church. The pontifical plenipotentiary thought it necessary to accept.

officially this declaration by a note dated the 28th of February. But that note never was answered. And on the 9th of June a bill was introduced in the Piedmontese Parliament regarding marriage—totally at variance with the declaration above-mentioned. The Pontifical plenipotentiary requested, in a note dated the 15th of July, an explanation of this circumstance. That note remained unnoticed until the 29th of July, when the Sardinian plenipotentiary stated that he had referred the question to his government. Here is a fresh instance of the double-dealing of the Sardinian government. The Count de Sambuy acted honestly and like a gentleman, but his employers evidently used his mission as a mask for their designs, and never intended it to produce any beneficial result. They accordingly proceeded with the abolition of the Sardinian tithes, and proposed to the chambers a bill which gave to the Sardinian clergy a provision very inadequate, and far less than the value of the confiscated property.

Any one acquainted with the country, might well wonder why the law respecting marriage was ever proposed by the government. The Press in this country dealt with the Sardinian Marriage Bill without considering the circumstances which make the case perfectly different from that of the legislation in England on the same matter. Here the law considers marriage as a civil contract, though celebrated with a religious ceremony. The Established Protestant Church denies marriage to be a sacrament, and the "Articles" merely describe it as a "state of life"—though the term sacrament is, as it were, *per incuriam*, applied to it in the Homily on *cursing and swearing*. And the Protestant Ecclesiastical Courts distinguish between the civil contract and the ceremony of marriage. The Protestant Church, therefore, could not here make any valid objection to a law allowing the civil celebration of the contract of marriage. And the innumerable multitude of different beliefs, sects, and denominations existing in this country certainly rendered it a hardship, that all those people should be compelled to conform to the marriage rites of the Established Church, especially as those rites are in themselves both tedious and otherwise objectionable. Here, therefore, there were strong grounds for rather allowing the validity for civil purposes of a civil marriage, than compelling all to conform to the rites of the Established Church, which is that of the minority of the

population. This is a practical view of the matter, under the circumstances; though to a Catholic the only right course would have been to allow no marriage to be valid between Catholics unless celebrated in accordance with the laws of the Catholic Church regarding the Sacrament of Marriage.

The circumstances of the case were very different in the Sardinian States. In that country the civil law viewed the marriage contract as a sacrament, and the Established Church allowed no separation of the contract from the sacrament. That Church was the Church of the whole nation, excepting a small number of Waldenses, who are governed by privileges of their own. It is evident, therefore, that the law requiring marriages to be celebrated in conformity with the Canons of the Church could be a hardship or a grievance to no one. It was a law in unison with the habits, and feelings, and opinions of the nation, and which gave rise to no inconvenience or difficulty whatsoever. Why, then, make any change? The preceding pages will enable the reader to answer this question without much difficulty. The policy of the government directed against the Church and the religious institutions of the country naturally pointed out for attack—matrimony, which unites to the character of a sacrament that of an institution—the very beginning and foundation of human society. It was evident to the Calvinist Cavour, and the disciples of the secret societies Rattazzi and Siccardi, that to deprive that most important institution of its sacramental character, and to impair the belief of the people in that character, would be a great blow to the Church and to Religion, and materially assist them in the furtherance of their views and projects for the separation of that country from the Holy See.

They accordingly, as we have seen, with their usual tortuous and dishonest policy, intimated to the Court of Rome that they intended proposing a new Marriage Law, declaring at the same time that they meant to abstain from proposing any provision violating the Canons of the Council of Trent regarding the Vinculum of Marriage, or in any way affecting the principles of the Catholic Church. But having thus disarmed suspicion, and given themselves the appearance (as usual) of seeking the consent of the Holy See previous to legislating, they introduced a Bill in Parliament utterly different from their declarations.

That bill made civil marriages valid, though contrary to the Canons of the Church, and in substance rendered matrimony, in the eye of the law, no longer a contract raised to the dignity of a sacrament, but a mere civil contract. The Holy See remonstrated. The Bishops protested, and petitioned against the Bill, which, in truth, legalised and encouraged concubinage, and violated the religion and morality of the country. They were, as usual, treated by the Government as disaffected persons, interfering with matters out of their sphere, and seeking to usurp an authority over the temporal power. Our English newspapers echoed these absurd charges, and obstinately shut their eyes to the facts of the case and the nature of the measure. It was represented to the British public that the Sardinian people viewed the Marriage Bill as a relief from "Priestcraft," and an indulgence to "liberty" of "conscience." Whereas, in reality, nobody wished for it except the Ministers and their partisans and the secret societies; and the Clergy spoke with the voice of the nation against an attack on the national religion and Church. The bill proceeded. The King wrote to the Sovereign Pontiff excusing himself and his government, and alleging that their Marriage Bill was similar to that adopted in other countries which were still in union with Rome. The Holy Father answered in a letter full of that mild dignity and inflexible justice which always characterised his sacred person. He pointed out that the Church could not admit any separation between the validity of the contract and that of the Sacrament of Marriage; for the Church could not admit the former to be of any efficacy without the requisites constituting the latter; that matrimony is not a contract to which a sacrament is added, but a contract raised by our Lord to the dignity of a sacrament; and that if in other countries civil marriages have been introduced, the Holy See had always protested against that innovation as unchristian and immoral, and had only submitted from necessity without ever acknowledging or sanctioning such a violation of the laws of the Church. These representations and admonitions of the Vicar of Christ, though ignorantly and scurrilously attacked by the English press, had their effect in Piedmont. The bill indeed passed the Chamber of Deputies, which electioneering, jobbing, and all the arts of a corrupt government had filled with the minions and obsequious followers

the Ministers, but it was thrown out by the Senate. If the Ministry had had the support of the nation, they would have appealed to the country by an immediate dissolution. But they knew well that the national verdict would have been against them, and that the indignation of the clergy and the people would have foiled even that system of corrupt influence under which the Chamber had been returned. They submitted to this defeat. And our readers must remember that they were foiled, not by a great and powerful body of hereditary nobles like our House of Lords, but by a Senate appointed by the Crown for life, and somewhat resembling in its composition the Privy Council in this country. They dared not dissolve the Chamber and go to the country; they dared not overwhelm the Senate with a creation of new senators. They ominously submitted to a disgraceful defeat, amidst the joy of the whole country, except the Ministers and their faction. Yet, in the face of these facts, Lord John Russell and Lord Palmerston persist in telling us that the Sardinian Ministers are the leaders of the nation and theponents of its wishes and opinions! Can anything be more absurd!"

We must return now to the negotiations. After six months of delay, on the 24th of August, the Sardinian government replied to the last note of the Pontifical plenipotentiary, declining to accept the proposed preamble, but agreeing to the matters contained in it, except the exemption of the bishops, which was to be matter of further negotiation, and pressing for the appointment of a mixed commission to examine and report on the mode of providing for the clergy of the Island of Sardinia in lieu of tithes, and a similar commission for the continental territories of the king. This was consented to by the Holy See, declaring at the same time that, reserving the exemption of the bishops from lay criminal jurisdiction, the other things contained in the preamble regarding ecclesiastical immunities, might be struck out of the preamble. The Sardinian government, however, proceeded no further with the business, but continued the execution of the law abolishing tithes, and brought in a bill to give a very inadequate and small compensation to the clergy. Count Sambuy was recalled, and Count de Pralormo appointed Chargé d'Affairs, without any powers to continue the negotiations. In truth the Sardinian government did

not wish to conclude anything. On the 1st December, 1853, the Cardinal Secretary of State, enquired by note what were the intentions of the Sardinian government regarding the suspended negotiation. And His Holiness, in an allocution pronounced in secret consistory, on the 19th of December, solemnly declared that the negotiations with Sardinia had ceased by the act of that government. The note of the Cardinal Secretary of State, which was followed by another, remained unanswered for two years; and yet the Sardinian government had the effrontery to charge the court of Rome with delaying the negotiations. On the 2nd of June, 1854, a note was directed by the Sardinian Cabinet to the Court of Rome, pretending that setting aside the matters before considered, an economical reform of the property of the clergy in His Majesty's continental states should be undertaken. The amount of that property was at the same time grossly misstated, and the government claimed to be exempt from the payment, to the clergy, of the compensation for the confiscation of their property by the French revolutionary government. In answer to this communication, the Papal plenipotentiary recalled the attention of Count de Pralormo to the state of the negotiations with the Count de Sambuy. He also declared that as for the reform of the temporal patrimony of the clergy, that demand was sufficiently answered, as the Pope had consented to the request of the cabinet of Turin for two mixed commissions to enquire into that subject, and report upon it both to the Holy See and to the government. But no useful result followed, for in September Count Pralormo directed another note to the Holy See, again insisting on the urgency of the matter, and that the government should be relieved from the payments to the clergy alluded to above. But the government were themselves causes of the urgency of the business, because they had not proceeded with the matter of the mixed commissions, and because they might have restrained those who pressed them, by saying that the subject was under negotiation. The Pontifical plenipotentiary then replied, that it was very difficult, if not impossible, to avoid leaving the business to the two mixed commissions, and solicited a categorical answer.

While this was going on, a bill was introduced in the Chamber, regarding the proposed suppression of the monastic orders. It provided that excepting the sisters of

harity and of St. Joseph, and those communities *principally* destined for education, or public instruction, or teaching, or the care of the sick, and which were to be designated by royal authority, all other religious communities and establishments should be suppressed. The bill so suppressed the chapters of the collegiate churches, with very few exceptions, and placed the whole of the property of the suppressed bodies under the administration of the State. This violent measure of confiscation was the more unjustifiable as the Holy See had consented to the appointment of two mixed commissions to examine fully the whole subject of ecclesiastical property. But it was in truth partly an expedient to meet an annual and increasing deficit in the budget of the state, and partly a step in the system of hostile policy of the government against the Church. It had been preceded by acts of violent spoliation against three venerable societies. The canons of Collegno offered half of their house as a hospital when the cholera broke out. This generous offer was accepted with thanks by the minister of the interior, who promised that the rights of the chapter could be respected. But soon he called on the canons to give up the other half of their house. They remonstrated, and said that it was their property and their home, and that they had a right to remain there. The minister, however, sent an armed force, who expelled these respectable ecclesiastics from their house in the middle of the night, and took possession of it. One of them was ill and had just been bled, but he was taken out of his bed and put down at the side of the road. We will proceed to the other outrages. The nuns of Santa Croce and the Capuchines of Turin, were peculiarly under the protection of the Queen-mother, to whom a daily intercourse with those pious ladies was a solace and a consolation. As her Majesty was opposed to the policy of the ministry, they were naturally objects of attack. They so were summoned to give up their convents for hospitals; and on their declining to accede to these demands, they were expelled by soldiers in the night, and their houses taken possession of by the government. Neither their sex, nor their sacred character, nor their virtues and the royal dignity of their august patroness obtained for them any mercy or forbearance. The object of the government no doubt was to prepare the way, by these

violations of the rights of property, for the general attack on ecclesiastical endowments by means of Rattazzi's bill, suppressing the convents and chapters.

That measure was sought to be justified on the ground that the property of the Church required to be better distributed, and further provision thereby made for the parochial clergy. But if this was the aim of the government, why did not they proceed with the appointment of the commissions assented to by Rome? That would have been the proper course, especially as those commissions had been proposed by the court of Turin itself. But the real character of the measure will best appear by reverting to a former one of the same nature. Let us ask, what would the House of Commons say, if the Chancellor of the Exchequer brought in a bill to sell the property of Guy's Hospital or St. Bartholomew's, and apply the proceeds to the Ways and Means of the year (thus sinking the capital), and to give merely the interest to the hospital? No possible contingency could bring into office in this country any administration capable of so infamous a proposal. And yet this has been done by the Cavour ministry at Turin! About two years ago they passed a bill enabling the government to sell the landed estates of the magnificent hospital of the Knights of St. Maurice and Lazarus, and giving to that establishment merely the interest of their property. This was an expedient to prop up a bankrupt exchequer, exhausted by jobbing and not the costly arts of party warfare. It was successful, because the parliament was packed, and the people unaccustomed to those means by which parliamentary government is prevented from degenerating into a wrong-headed tyranny. The country murmured; but the measure was passed by the minions of the government. The Calvinist tendencies of Cavour, and the principles of the secret societies with which Rattazzi was imbued, made them determine to take this first step towards the spoliation of religious bodies. But people asked themselves what would become of that benevolent and pious and splendid institution, if the difficulties of the government increased? What, if it became inconvenient to pay the interest of the value of the confiscated lands? Was it probable that the ministers who had proposed such a violent attack on property as the confiscation of the freehold, would scruple to refuse payment of the interest? It was obvious that the institution

rested on very insecure grounds, and that a government with a growing deficit was not a very safe creditor ; and, at any rate, there was a great difference between two millions of francs in freehold property and an annuity equal to the interest of two millions.

On this model the famous Convents' Bill was framed. Count Cavour himself confessed that it was a financial measure. It was intended, in the first place, to exonerate the government from paying to the parochial clergy the annual subsidies given in consideration of property confiscated by the French. But this annual charge was a debt to which the king's government had become liable when he returned to his dominions in 1814. *Res transit cum onere*. It was a debt running with the land, and it could not be repudiated without dishonesty. This is still more evident with regard to the Duchy of Genoa, which was a new acquisition obtained at the peace, subject to that charge. This repudiation was not the only lucre that the government obtained by the bill. That bill was a measure of confiscation, or a forced loan, under the thin disguise of redistribution. This is evident, for the bill provided for the *sale of the capital*, and the application of the proceeds to whatever purpose the executive government should think fit. The payments to the parochial clergy, and pensions to the monks and nuns, were to be made by means of government paper, an addition to the funded debt of the state. The fact is that the government wanted the money to meet the deficit in the ways and means of the year. In a short time, under the authority of this law, the property will be sold and the proceeds gone, and the clergy will have nothing but the government debentures. And it is not very likely that in future these payments will be held more sacred by the state than those to which we have adverted above, and which also represented ecclesiastical property taken by the civil power. We wish our space would enable us to reproduce the discussions on the bill in the Piedmontese parliament, especially the statesmanlike and splendid speeches of the Marquis of Brignole Sale, and Count Solar de la Margherita. Those speeches were interrupted by the clamour of the mob in the galleries. The advocate Bixio, a man of high character and learning, and at the head of the Genoese bar, addressed a petition to the senate, showing the injustice of the measure, and its incompatibility with the principles of juris-

prudence and the fundamental laws of the kingdom. On the side of the ministry much ability and sophistry were displayed. The chief argument was, that corporate bodies were creatures of the municipal law, that the state was therefore able to terminate their legal existence, and that the effect of their extinction must be the devolution of their property to the state. But it seems strange that the government should destroy these bodies for the purpose of taking their property, without any charge made against them, thus profiting by its own wrong. And the argument itself is fallacious, and contrary to the principles of jurisprudence. For although certain legal incidents of a corporate body, giving it the civil status of *persona*, be matter of municipal arbitrary law, the right of association is *juris gentium*, and if the legal civil *personality* of a corporate body be extinguished, it may still remain an association by virtue of agreement among its members, and so still hold property. Besides, the ecclesiastical bodies in the Sardinian states had all acquired their property within the memory of man, and they had done so on the faith of the laws of the land. To take away that property, except for some crime involving forfeiture, was a gross breach of public faith. The members of those religious societies had brought their portions into the common stock, intending to secure to themselves a home for the rest of their lives, in conformity with their pious dispositions and habits. To take from them their property, and turn them adrift with a pension, was, especially in the case of women, and persons advanced in life, an act of gross cruelty and injustice. If the legislature thought fit to abolish monastic institutions on grounds of public policy, that was no reason for seizing property which never was intended by the donors to devolve on the state. And in a Catholic country, where the constitution declared the Catholic religion to be the only religion of the state, it was impossible not to see the criminality of an act of spoliation, bringing down on all persons concurring in it, the condemnation of the Council of Trent. The Holy See mildly but firmly and solemnly reminded the government of these consequences, but to no purpose. The king was shaken by the calamities which fell on his family. And the connection of those calamities with the sacrilegious measures of the government rendered them still more striking. The queen mother had never recovered the outrages committed

against her favourite communities. Her last illness was caused by distress of mind and sad forebodings of evil to her country, her Church, and her family. Her death caused that of the queen consort, then in childbirth, to whom daily and affectionate intercourse with her was a necessary consolation. The death of those two august and saintly ladies, within the short space of ten days, caused a gloom throughout the country. Two of the king's sons were dangerously ill, and the death of his brother, the Duke of Genoa, was daily expected. The grief of the unfortunate monarch excited the deepest compassion. He felt that his ministers were the authors of his misfortunes. But the Rattazzi Law proceeded. The senate considerably modified it. The abolition of the monastic bodies was struck out, and the bill was reduced to little more than a mere act of spoliation and robbery. The ministers submitted to this defeat, and we have here a confirmation of our statement, that the nation was not with them. If they had had the support of public opinion, they would never have submitted to that defeat in the senate; but they feared to excite too far the public indignation, and they were forced to remain satisfied with having perpetrated a shameless and most infamous robbery.

Our readers will not be surprised that the law against the clergy, passed in a spirit of injustice and rapacity, is executed with brutality and indecency. We have a letter from a person of high rank and character, giving a sketch of the proceedings of the officials charged with the execution of the Rattazzi Law. The regular clergy of both sexes have behaved with the utmost calmness and dignity. They resigned themselves to the calamity which has fallen on them. The agents of the government could not find the witnesses required by the bill. In many cases the local authorities would not act. A judge in Savoy declined to act, and was removed from his office. All persons possessing any self-respect refused to be accomplices of this monstrous violation of the rights of property. In each instance the myrmidons of the law present themselves before the gates of the convent or monastery. They knock repeatedly. No answer is made. Then they resort to the tools in use among house-breakers, and force their way by violence into those abodes of peace, meditation, charity, and prayer. The abbess or other superior appears and reads the edict of excommunication pronounced by the

Council of Trent against the spoliators of the Church. Even the minions and servants of the minister turn pale. They know the wickedness of the work which for their daily bread, or the hope of reward, they have undertaken. They feel that they and their masters are violating the laws of the Church, and those on which all human society is founded. But they proceed. They search everything and everywhere, and take their inventory. Chalices, sacred vestments, crucifixes, shrines, and church ornaments—nothing escapes them. They force their way into the cells of the nuns, and search every corner, and open every drawer and box. They even break off the tops of the chests of drawers. In one convent at Genoa, that of SS. Giacomo e Filippo, they found a piece of paper doubled up under the marble slab which covered a chest of drawers, and exclaimed, “The nuns conceal their papers!” But to their great disappointment the papers turned out to be engravings of the Blessed Virgin. The mother abbess related this to our noble informant, with the most touching serenity and gentleness. They remained for *six hours* in this convent. During that time all the nuns, except the abbess and the mother-vicar, who kept present, were in the church praying. Rattazzi, the brother of the minister, is the chief agent in these disgraceful proceedings, and his brutality and insolence are almost beyond credibility.

Any one reading these statements, or witnessing the facts which they relate, might suppose that the country where such things happened must be in a state of lawless revolution, and the security of persons and property trampled under foot by a mob. But what we have described is in truth far more revolting, as the cool deliberate wickedness of a sane man is morally worse than the excesses of a raving lunatic. We see a regular government professing principles of liberality and enlightened policy, deliberately violating the rights of property, and at the same time inflicting insult and contumely on persons whose sex and whose sacred character should protect them even in barbarous countries.

We may perhaps be asked whether these acts of injustice and violence, and that unjust law under which they are perpetrated, are not sanctioned by public opinion and the acquiescence of the people? We answer that it is not so. The causes to which we have already adverted

sufficiently explain the apparent apathy of the nation. They do not understand how to agitate. The power of the Executive Government, backed by a packed House of deputies, prevents all opposition to the prevailing faction. But a change is in progress which will give effect to the real opinions of the nation. The last municipal elections at Genoa gave a considerable majority to the party who would maintain the rights of the Church and the sound principles of the constitution. The same has occurred at Annecy, Chambery, and other places. This was an important trial of electioneering strength, and the result shows that whenever a general election takes place, a sounder Chamber will be returned. In the meantime the difficulties of the government increase. They have involved the country in a war of which no one sees the end, and from which the state can derive no advantage. The deficit in the annual budget augments. The refugees are difficult to manage, and little to be trusted. Everywhere the secret societies are rife, undermining order, property, and religion, and rendering the task of governing more and more difficult. The natural effect of the internal policy of Messieurs Cavour and Rattazzi is to foment the development and increase of the revolutionary party. And accordingly they are from time to time compelled to arrest and deal very arbitrarily with men who profess and even believe themselves to be true Italian patriots. These repressive measures render the conspirators and adepts in the mysteries of the secret societies discontented and ready to disturb the peace. Under these circumstances the government must be weakened daily. Mazzinian plots are discovered frequently, and arrests are made. How is all this to end? It is difficult to look the facts in the face and not to see that some convulsion must inevitably take place, unless there be a great change in the government.

France must, as well as Austria, see the danger of that focus of revolution which the Sardinian States now present. France will be obliged to interfere, with the concurrence of Austria, for the sake of the maintenance of tranquillity in its own state, and to prevent the subversion of its monarchy, and so foreign power will make a change in the country. This result can only be arrested by the patriotic efforts of the people to obtain a real part in the working of the constitution by means of their representa-

tives. If this cannot be done, the Sardinian constitution must meet the fate of many others, and be extinguished in revolution and military power.

The paternal clemency of the Holy See could no longer resist the demands of justice. The Sovereign Pontiff has just pronounced an allocution, solemnly condemning the perpetrators of this act of spoliation, with all their accomplices, and declaring it by his Apostolic Authority null and void.

We have now reached the latest event of this lamentable history, which has been so misunderstood and so studiously misrepresented in this country. It has hitherto been placed by the press in such a light as to gratify the prejudices of Englishmen, who easily believe whatever pleases them. *Populus vult decipiri et decipietur*. The "British public" likes to be told there is a great Protestant movement in the dominions of the House of Savoy. The House of Commons cheers the vulgar and brutal invective of Whiteside, who says that it ought to imitate the Piedmontese Parliament, and suppress the Monastic Orders. Neither the public nor the House will open their eyes to the fact, that the Piedmontese Parliament has *not* suppressed the Monastic Orders; and that those venerable societies have been, not condemned by a nation, but robbed by a faction. John Bull insists on living in a sort of fool's paradise, believing that what suits his prejudices is a real thing; and he is angry with any one who tells him the truth. And so the newspapers go on telling him what he likes to hear every morning to assist the digestion of his breakfast. But still there is such a thing as truth; and, somehow or other, it will make its way in every country not utterly lost and degraded. A sense of honour and justice can never be eradicated from the breast of an Englishman. He has many and obstinate prejudices; but he prides himself on a sort of impartiality, which rebels against falsehood and rejects misrepresentation; and he secretly despises those who pander to his favourite errors and his inveterate opinions. These reflections make us feel that we are discharging a duty to our countrymen by coming forward to tell them the TRUTH about the affairs of Italy.

Time will show the fruits of that policy which has obtained for Mr. de Cavour so much popularity in England. It is contrary to the feelings and convictions of

the people of the Sardinian States. It is at variance with honest, straightforward dealing, and the faith of treaties. It is injurious to religion. It has brought on the country the censures of the Holy See. Such a state of things cannot last. It must lead to some great change. But, in the meantime we submit to those who are encouraging Sardinia in a progress towards ruin, this plain statement of the political condition of that unfortunate country.

ART. VII.—*JASHAR, Fragmenta archetypa carminum Hebraicorum in Masorethico Veteris Testamenti textu passim tessellata; collegit, ordinavit, restituit, in unum corpus redegit, Latine exhibuit, commentario instruxit* JOANNES GUILIELMUS DONALDSON, S.T.D., Collegii SS. Trinitatis apud Cantabrigienses olim socius.

JASHAR, Original fragments of Hebrew Poems, interwoven with many parts of the Masoretic text of the Old Testament. Collected, put in order, restored, united into one body, translated into Latin, and commented on, by JOHN WILLIAM DONALDSON, D.D., and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, 1 vol. 8vo. London: Williams and Norgate. Berlin: Hertz. Printed in the latter place.

THERE is a fable grown old even to the young, of a stag, which having apparently a taste for the insipid and the brackish, chose to feed on the sea-side. It was not the "milk-white doe" of more modern fable, but some worldly-wise member of a cervine flock, who separated himself from the companions of his youth, in search of what he considered liberty. On the one side of his chosen narrow territory were the broad and fertile pastures which he had quitted, where multitudes continued to feed in peace. On the other, roared the troubled ocean, with its tossing billows, treacherous quicksands, boisterous blasts, and sunken rocks. On which side lay danger? deliberated the wily seceder. Now it so happened that he

was afflicted with the very common defect of one-sightedness, as well as one-sidedness. All his terrors were about the land of his fathers, all his apprehensions were connected with the pleasant fields where he had passed his youth; while his turbulent neighbour, the abyss of many waters, seemed unlikely to assail his isolated abode. He turned his one keen eye, as he gazed, to the inland foe, he turned but an unconcerned ear to the tumultuous deep. At length when one day he fell, the fatal arrow was quivering in the blind unguarded side, and the hunters who quietly cut him up, and shared his quarters, disembarked from the sea upon the beach.

Need we explain, or rather apply, our parable? This self-willed wanderer from the "spacious place" where it had been fed with many others, from the abode of security, unity, and peace, which approached the border of that seething gulf where boil and roar the billows of disunion, of strife, of heresy, and finally of infidelity, all "foaming out their own confusion," (Jude 12) and thinks itself holding "a middle way" between the two, cannot be mistaken. Towards the place which it has left it turns its one jealous eye. It apprehends from the papal fold unceasing danger, and watches every movement of instinctive life as preparation for an attack on itself. To the other side it pays no attention. Dissent may multiply itself, by division, into a thousand new polypi, each capable of further subdivision; and, still worse, infidelity may creep on and on, and narrow its precarious holding, and undermine, with sullen strokes, its very standing place. It heeds not, so that popery can be checked. But we will venture to say that the dreaded stroke will come, at last, from the dementedly blind side, that on which the ecclesiastical eye has been long slumbering in fatal security. Nay, the bow has been drawn close, the string has vibrated, and the first shaft has anchored in its side. "*Hæret lateri lethalis arundo.*" It is a poisonous infidelity.

We are inclined, however, to look at the subject from a different point. The ecclesiastical Establishment of this country has been anxiously engaged for many years back, in opposing the introduction of novelties in practice and in teaching. But in doing this, it has exhibited not merely the one-sidedness to which we have alluded, but still more a littleness and narrowness which brings it within the reach of a severer reproof than any from us can be. We

cannot forget the condemnation of those who attend to the tithes of mint and cummin, but neglect the weightier things of the law, (Matt. xxxiii. 23,) nor of those who strain out a gnat, but swallow a camel. (Ib. 24.) If a stone altar is erected, it throws thousands into convulsions, and forms matter for judicial proceedings, the great cause of Vandal v. Goth, carried of course by the former. If flower-pots presume to bear upon "the table," no longer allowed to be an altar, the most beautiful and innocent of God's gifts, Exeter rises in judgment, and withers them with his destructive touch. Is the sermon to be preached in gown or in surplice? At the suggestion of such an enquiry men's hair seems spiritually to stand on end: at the attempt to appear in one of the two vestures, the ladies go into hysterics, the gentlemen into a rage; many people out of church, and some into dissent. Episcopal charges are brought into action, and strong prohibitions are pronounced, to allay the ferment. Shall the service be chaunted or recited, shall the sustained monotone or mere reading be used, shall cathedral services be performed in parochial churches, or in chapels no longer of ease? Zealous butlers lead on the mob without, and no less zealous young men lead the choir within, till a mingled holocaust of murdered notes jars upwards towards, if not to, heaven. Officious churchwardens are collared in church, and police courts become the theatre of parochial war; till St. Paul and St. Barnabas might well, if present, again rend their garments (Acts xiv. 13,) at seeing the frightful scissure in their supposed congregations. And so, on the "prayer for the Church militant," and crosses, and candlesticks, and stained windows, and painted walls, the Anglican episcopate is great and valiant, and fiery with expurgatory zeal, and curiously watchful, lest the first deviation from Puritanical stiffness, or Calvinistic coldness, should prove a first step towards the genial and generous regions of the Church.

What a swarm of small gnats have not the rulers of this national system thus endeavoured to strain out of the food prepared by them for their followers! Not a filament of a limb, not a film of a wing of the little popish creatures has been allowed to spoil the confections of these savoury manipulators. But the camel that comes dry, parched, hard and uncouth as the desert whence he springs, walks boldly in, a huge mass of ill-made-up heresies, with a lumping

hunch of infidelity on his back, and nobody interferes with his progress. Nay, strange to say, he and his followers, as many as Madian and Ephraim can send, are not only freely admitted within the mosquito-curtains of the national sanctuary, but, to their own astonishment, are eagerly swallowed, and melt endearingly in the complacent stomach of expansive Anglicanism. How little does the anti-baptismal decision of the Gorham case now disturb any ecclesiastical digestion.

But we must change our strain, and strike a graver chord. Although inconsistency often borders on the absurd, and so provokes lighter handling, infidelity will not admit it. It is too closely allied with the dark and the deep in the spiritual life to be treated otherwise than in sad and sober earnestness. The book before us recalls us from any playfulness of vein in which we may have indulged, and throws a weight upon our responsibility in which we are far from delighting.

Dr. Donaldson is a learned, a shrewd, and an ingenious scholar. He has been advantageously known for years, as a philologist of more than ordinary attainments, as a commentator on Pindar and Sophocles, and the compiler of a Hebrew, a Greek, and a Latin grammar. In addition to the titles which he wears on the title-page of his new work, of Doctor of Divinity in the English Establishment, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, he is actually, we believe Head Master of the Grammar School of Bury St. Edmund's; consequently not only a recognized teacher of theology, but an actual instructor of youth, under the guardianship of the episcopal body recognised by the State.

"Since," he tells us, "Divine Providence called me away from the study of law, first to philology, and then to theology, I have received this one talent; I have obtained one means and instrument of the ministry, which I have considered it a sacred duty not to hide in the earth, lest I should darken my candle, whatever worth, in the obscurity of the bushel."—p. 36.

We quote these words, that so much of his own history as the author has chosen to communicate may be known at the outset. Further we profess to know nothing; nor have we to deal with him in any other capacity, than in that of an author, who constitutes the public his judge; however he may, as Dr. Donaldson does immediately

ter the words just quoted, reserve his reward to the future judgment. We neutralise, by previous acceptance, all assurances that he is upright, amiable, honourable, and blameless in all the relations of life. These nowadays are incompatible with the publication of flagrant infidelity. And this charge we are bound deliberately to bring against the book of "Jashar."

It is a sealed book to the great class of English readers; who seldom ask at their circulating library for a volume written in modern Latin, and having three or four sentences of untranslated Greek and a dozen Hebrew words per page, with a dash here and there of Arabic or Syriac, and a relish of German. Moreover it was printed in Germany, and has a foreign face on its type, not congenial to English eyes. Why therefore disturb its silent course, through the smoky regions of Teutonic study, at Halle, Göttingen, Heidelberg or Rostock? Why call attention to it, and reveal its dangers where hitherto unknown? Our reasons for this line of conduct may be better seen hereafter. Suffice it now to say, that we consider it a duty to expose every symptom of that plague which necessarily springs from undirected liberty of religious speculation.

What, the reader will first ask, is the meaning of the title given to the work?

Twice in the Old Testament the book of *Jashar* or *Jasher* is quoted, once in Josue x. 13, and once in the second book of Kings or Samuel i. 18. The Vulgate translates the name, calling the work "the Book of the just." Each of these references is connected with a short poetical effusion, the first with the account of Josue's address to the sun, the second with David's lamentation over Saul and Jonathan.

It is not worth while disputing minor questions arising from these references. We will at once admit that there was a book named the Book of Jashar, and that it consisted of, or at least contained, various poems. But we cannot feel so sure why it bore that name. It may have been compiled by a person to whom this epithet had been given, for it simply means "the book of the upright man."* Or it may have taken its name, like books of

* In words connected with this meaning, we have a difficulty in finding an adjective corresponding exactly with the abstract quality. Thus we have *rectitude*, and *probity*, without any corresponding

Scripture, from its first word ; or it may have been familiarly called so from some particular passage, as the very plaint of David seems to have been called "The Bow," from a beautiful phrase in it. These are some of the many conjectures hazarded by commentators, who believe this book to have been a collection of various pieces. There is little enough of certainty ; merely two facts, that there was an ancient book called "Jashar," and that Jashar means either "an upright man," or "uprightness."

Slight as is this foundation, it suffices to bear Dr. Donaldson's whole theory—that as this epithet is often applied to the Israelites, as a title, though always in the plural, and indeed, according to him, forms the basis of the very name of Israel, (*quasi Isr-el*), "it is sufficiently evident what sort of a book was this of Jashar. It was undoubtedly a collection of old poems, and other monuments connected with the piety and history of the people who worshipped Jehova. Whether with the Septuagint you render it 'the book of uprightness,' or with the Chaldaic, 'the book of the law,' *you must conclude*, that this book was a compilation or collection, containing all those fragments which delivered the rule of religion, the pith of the law, which either exhibited the nature of probity, or celebrated the victories of the true and sincere Israelites, proclaimed their felicity, or promised their future happiness. *Whatever, of this character, found mixed up with the sacred writings of the Jews may be reckoned an old fragment, will claim a place among the remains of the book of Jashar, and return to it, by right of restoration.*" (p. 25.)

Here is indeed a bold and quick arrival at a conclusion. But we must observe, at the outset, that our author is not deterred by trifles. When he does gain a consequence, whether by the circuitous route of emendations, transpositions, conjectures and metamorphoses, or by the one spring over five-barred difficulties, which have baulked the most daring in the chase before him, he always reaches his

epithet : whereas in Latin *rectus* and *probus* are the very words we want, especially the first, for *Jashar*. We shall therefore always use the words *upright*, and *uprightness*, when we wish to convey the corresponding terms for Dr. Donaldson's explanation of that Hebrew word.

point with a confidence, a positiveness, not to say an assurance, which almost makes his reader afraid he must be right. There having been a book entitled of "the upright," nay even "of the law," you *must* conclude not only that it contained a certain class of poems, but that every poem in Scripture that can be brought into that class was necessarily in it. We will test this assertion later, more particularly. For the present let us see the extent of this swelling conclusion. Because twice in Scripture a few lines are quoted from a book, our author undertakes to apportion to it a series of long extracts, in prose and verse, ranging from Genesis to the Psalms, divided into seven distinct parts, each part again subdivided into fragments, not following one another consecutively in the scriptural volume, but picked out from different places, and brought into connection on a merely arbitrary plan of distribution. In fine, the imaginary book of Jashar was composed of the following parts.

PART THE FIRST. The history of creation, to show that man, created upright, fell through carnal wisdom. First fragment, made up from parts of Genesis i., vi., viii., vi. Second fragment, parts of Genesis ii. and iii.

PART THE SECOND. The family of Abraham adopted as "the upright," to be sons of God. First fragment, rejection of the families of Cham and Chanaan, in general, (Gen. ix.). Second fragment, rejection of the Kiunnæans, (Gen. iv.) Third fragment, rejection of the Agarenes (Gen. xvi., xvii. xxi.) Fourth fragment, rejection of the Idumeans. (Gen. xxiv. xxvii.)

PART THE THIRD. "The upright Israelites, escaped from Egypt, after forty years passed in the desert, and many other fluctuations of fortune, dedicate a temple to Jehova, in a tranquil land, under the peaceful king Solomon," (Gen. viii. 6-2.) Let the reader mark the reference.

PART THE FOURTH. "The Laws of God to be observed by the upright people." First fragment, the ten commandments, (Deut. v.) Second fragment, the pith of the divine law, (Deut. vi., x., xi.) Third fragment, the inculcation of obedience, (Deut. viii. vi.)

PART THE FIFTH. "Blessings and exhortations to the upright," Canticles of Jacob, (Gen. xlix.), of Balaam, (Numb. xxiii., xxiv.), and of Moses, (Deut. xxxii., xxxiii.)

PART THE SIXTH. "Wonderful victories and liberations of the people." Ovation of Moses and Mary, (Exod. xv.), of Josue (Jos. x.), and of Debora (Jud. v.)

PART THE SEVENTH. "Various songs on the rule and happiness of the upright during the reigns of David and Solomon."

We shall have to lead our readers through these different parts, to enable them to see clearly the religious opinions proposed by our author. But we are met at the threshold by one or two important enquiries. For example, when was this book of Jashar compiled, or when were the songs of which it is to be reconstructed, originally put together?

Dr. Donaldson unhesitatingly answers, during the reign of Solomon, the Augustan age, no doubt, of Hebrew literature. "The king himself wrote a good deal, and we possess many remnants left by him, relating to philosophy and poetry. He may have been a tyrant, but he was a theocrat, and religious, and one who professed to have received divine inspiration," (p. 26). Such is the character given of Solomon and of his writings, which Christians, as well as Jews, have revered as belonging to something higher than is here allowed them. Material happiness and prosperity having now reached their summit, no time seems more suitable for extolling the privileges of the upright people, and for putting together whatever described this happy lot reserved to it.

Such are the general grounds for attributing this Authology, as our author sometimes calls it, to the time of Solomon. Then he proceeds to more particular proofs, which are certainly good evidences of system-building power. We will run through them. The second, for instance, is this, "As in the blessing of Jacob's children, which is certainly to be referred to the Jasharan collection, all the tribes are mentioned as still living together, our Authology must have been anterior to Jeroboam's schism," (p. 27.) The third is, that in the same blessing (Gen. xlix. 5) occurs the Greek word μάχαιρα for a sword, and that this could not have been introduced into Hebrew, till after David had surrounded himself with Cretan guards the Cerethi of the vulgate. This is altogether a tissue of uncertainties.*

* To build a theory, which would overthrow admitted doctrines

But the reader will at once see, that these arguments, if sound, prove, not merely that the book of Jashar was put

respecting Scripture, upon disputed translations of words and sentences is surely not merely dangerous, but unfair. In this instance, there is no proof that the Cerethi were Cretans, nor that a Greek word occurs in the passage, nor that the word means necessarily a sword. We throw this discussion into a note, as not likely to interest general readers. First as to the Cretan satellites, or prætorian guards supposed to have been introduced by David; it is principally a similarity of names that gives colour to a conjecture made by Calmet, and led the Septuagint to give a similar version, in passages which will not bear it. It is certain that before David came to the throne, there was a tribe bearing this name. For during Saul's lifetime, a young Egyptian captive says to David, "We made an incursion against *the Cerethi*, כֶּרֶתִּי and the territory of Juda..... and burnt Siceleg with fire" (1 Reg. or Sam. xxx. 14.) It is also plain from Ezechiel (xxv. 16) that there was a Philistine tribe of the name, dwelling on the sea-coast. Indeed there is a play of words on the name useful in other respects. "I will stretch out my hand against the Philistines," (to whose guilt alone the passage refers,) "and I will *curt-ail* the *Kerethim*, and I will destroy the remnant on the sea-coast." In Sophonias it is the same. "Wo to you, inhabitants of the coast-nation of Kerethim; the word of the Lord is against thee, Canaan, land of the Philistines," (ii. 5.) These are not the Cretans surely, but a Canaanite tribe. If thus we find such a clan existing before David, and continuing to the time of Ezechiel, settled in the land of Palestine, why conclude, or rather conjecture, that the Kerethi whom he enlisted in his service, and who are united (2 Reg. xv. 18.) with the Pelethi, whom Dr. Donaldson himself calls Philistines, (p. 128) were not members of this tribe, but people of the same name brought from Crete? If we read in our history that the Queen was escorted by the Boston militia, what should we think of a foreign historian, who should conjecture that they were a body guard brought from America? We should say that Boston existed in England first, and continues till our time, and probably gave rise, by colonization, to its more distinguished namesake across the Atlantic. And so we may say here. If the similarity of names between Cretans and Kerethi be such that one must be derived from the other, surely, as the gulf-stream of emigration and colonization set in from the east towards the west, and since the Phœnicians as we call them generically, that is the mixed tribe, from the coast of Palestine, have left traces of themselves, waifs and strays on each side of their course, on the north in Cyprus, Malta, Sicily, France, Spain, and still further, on the south along the African coast to Carthage and beyond, it would have been strange if Crete had not been visited, and even become a

together in the reign of Solomon, but that the pieces composing it, at least the prophecy or blessing attributed to

settlement. And after all, the traditions of Cadmus, "the eastern" in Greece prove the influence of Asia on Greece. Or why not make David's guards to have been Curetes from Sabina, or *κουρητες* from Phrygia? Each is more like the Hebrew. Which conjecture then is more probable, that as most of the islands and countries from Tyre to the Columns of Hercules obtained, and yet retain names of Palestinic origin, so Crete should have suffered the same fate; or that David should have sent for Cretan guards, while we have a tribe close to him bearing the name attributed to them?

The play upon the words in Sophonias suggest the possibility after all, of the opinion which makes David's body guards to have been composed of two classes, not two nations, the *Kerethim* slayers or executioners, from כרת *Karath*, to cut off or destroy, and the *Pelethim* runners, from a root existing in Arabic, with an analogous one פלץ in Hebrew, to be fleet. The version Philistine, which Dr. Donaldson takes from Ewald, has not been generally adopted.

The next question is, does a Greek word occur in Jacob's prophecy? The word in question is מכרות "their *mekaroth*," and this is the supposed plural of *mekera*; (see also p. 196) we say supposed, because the word occurs no where else in Scripture either in singular or plural. We do not suppose that Dr. Donaldson would derive μάχαιρα from μαχομαι, as some etymologists do: for the *p* seems manifestly radical. Whether, however, he does or not, the Hebrew word has its analogous derivatives from a common root, through which the idea of piercing or digging, as in *transfodera*, prevails. There is no evidence that the Greeks may not have learnt the word from the Phœnicians, from, or through whom, they learnt probably many uses of war. The word παρίδεισος, though in form so Greek, came from Persia, nearly as it stands. The Hebrew כפר *kopher* and the Greek κύπρος are the same in letters and meaning; shall we conclude that the Canticle of Canticles in which it occurs, (i. 14) drew it from Greece? Or does מור *mor* come from μυρρα or, לבנה *Lebona* incense from λίβανος, or נכח *carcum* from κροκον or *crocum* (more commonly written as a masculine), though etymologists find a plausible root in Greek and we have none in Hebrew. These two words would also form an argument for the Canticle in which they occur, having been subject to Hellenic influences on the language of Judea. Or does מסך *masak* to mix, come from μισγειν. We might multiply examples to any extent. But is it impossible that even such a similarity of words may have been accidental? St. Jerome translated נחם *nughe* in Sophon. iii. 18, by *nugæ*, *C* purpose to show a coincidence between Hebrew and Latin.

If therefore μάχαιρα is to be found in Jacob's prophecy, we are

Jacob, in Genesis, was only written at that later period, and consequently was not Jacob's, but is a forgery falsely attributed to him, and no prophecy. But more of this later. The next argument, from the same blessing is more startling. "As the most probable interpretation of a difficult passage in the same canticle (Gen. xlix. 10,) recognises by name Solomon (*Shelomoh*) in the abbreviated form of *Shiloh*, as the man of rest, (1 Paralip. xxii. 9,) this song was composed in his time." So there is an end to what has been considered one of the standard prophecies of the time, coincident with Christ's coming, of the Messiah's appearance on earth. The last is also singular. In the prophecy of Isaac to his sons, he tells Esau that he shall shake off his brother's yoke. (Gen. xxvii. 40.) Now this took place in the time of Solomon, by Adad, the last almost of the slaughtered Idumeans, reigning in Syria. (3 Reg. xi. 25.) This argument proceeds on the assumption, that Isaac's prophecy was no more his than Jacob's was that patriarch's, but *must* have been written after the event, which it describes as future and prophetically announced!

The form of these arguments is also peculiar. Let us first assume that such and such portions formed a book called Jashar. Now there is internal evidence that they could not have been written before Solomon's time; therefore the book was not compiled before it. If Dr. Donaldson had only chosen to admit into his Jashar a few other pieces, such as the song of the three children in Daniel, he might have proved that the book of Jashar was not compiled till the Babylonian captivity. We are forgetting however that their history, as well as that of Daniel in the lions' den, according to Dr. Donaldson, is only a fable. (p. 306.)

But, in truth, we do not see why Dr. Donaldson should limit, on his own principles, the compositions that enter into the book of Jashar. He has no doubt first to determine that it was put together in Solomon's time, and then, having introduced into the series only what is com-

quite as entitled to make it a word learnt by Greece from Asia, as to build a theory upon the opposite genealogy. And finally it is by no means universally admitted that the word means a sword at all; as the Lexicographers will show.

patible with that scheme, argue back, from its internal evidence, that it was compiled at that time. If the book was of such a definite character, that he can exactly determine all that entered into it, without reference to age, he ought to admit all into it that bears that decided Jasharan stamp, wherever it occurs. It is as easy to bring down to the age of its compilation what stands recorded at a later period, as to bring up to it what has been always considered earlier. Why should not a canticle in *Isaias* be pronounced Jasharan as well as one in *Genesis*, and be equally attributed to Solomon's time, if it be proved to have the necessary characteristics, and it can be proved that the book of *Jashar* was then compiled? But if the latter cannot be proved *a priori*, then such a canticle comes into the data for determining the age. Let us illustrate our meaning by an example.

The twenty-sixth chapter of *Isaias* contains evidently a detached canticle, introduced by these words: "In that day shall be sung this song, in the land of *Juda*." It would not be difficult to show, on Dr. Donaldson's plan, that this composition has stronger marks of a Jasharan fragment than others which he has inserted in his collection. And further, we would give the reader his choice, whether it should be made plausibly evident, by such arguments as he uses, that it is a fragment of earlier date, in fact of David's or Solomon's time, or should be proved to belong to a later period than even *Isaias*'s. In the latter case, of course it would follow, that the book of *Jashar* was a much later compilation than he makes it.

Dr. Donaldson considers it a strong primary evidence of the "indoles Jasharana" of a composition, that it contains the word *Jashar*. For of Balaam's prophecy he says, "If there had been nothing else relative to this matter, except that wish, 'may I die the death of those *upright* men!' I could not have failed to recognize there the spirit and matter of the book of *Jashar*," (p. 211.) And again of the Canticle of *Moses*, he writes, "That it was composed expressly for insertion in the Jasharan collection, I conclude from the use three times in it of the poetic name *Jeshurun*." (p. 221.) Now in no other poem is this normal word so decidedly used, together with its equivalent, and parallel צַדִּיק *tzadik* just, (p. 21,) as in this; as if to indicate that the canticle particularly celebrates the triumph of the poor and despised people of God, (compare

Anna's Jasharan song, p. 290,) who walk in the paths of justice and uprightness, over the strong and powerful, but wicked. We will give the verse as it is in the Anglican version, though we do not consider it to be correct. "The way of the *just* is *uprightness*; thou most *upright* dost weigh the path of the *just*." (v. 7.)

Here then we have a poem which "indolem Jasharanam apprime sapit," having its stamp in its object and its phrases. But in addition it has other secondary marks. It calls God by the abbreviated name of Jah, (v. 4,) of which, our commentator tells us, in proving that Psalm lxviii. (Heb.) belongs to his favourite collection; "Even that more ancient form *Jah* alludes to Exod. xv. 2," (a most genuine Jasharan piece,) "which passage Isaias also has imitated." (xii. 2.—p. 336.) The presence of this word corroborates our more direct proof, that this chapter belongs to Jashar. But further, in the same verse God is called צור *tzur*, a rock, a peculiar title which occurs several times in Jasharan compositions, such as the Cantic of Moses, "a poem which Isaias *seems* to have known." (p. 223.)

We think there is as much ground for admitting this poem into the book of Jashar, as for any placed in it by Dr. Donaldson, unless it be decided beforehand, that nothing later than Solomon's time can be introduced; in which case it looks very uncritical, to pretend to prove from the internal evidence of the documents, that they were put together then.

However, what if one could show, on the sort of reasoning which Dr. Donaldson triumphs on using, that this chapter of Isaias has lost its place, and was written in the time of David? Nothing more easy. We could tell the reader to compare v. 2 with Ps. cxix. 19, 20,* where the gates are ordered to be opened, for the *just* to enter in, (that is גוי צדיק *goi tzadik* the just nation, or Israelites, in the prophet); the expression "keeping truth," with Ps. cxlvi. 7; in v. 3 the peculiar form for "trusting in Thee," (בך בטח) only we believe to be found in Ps. cxix. 7, verse 3. "The way of Thy judgments," we would compare with Prov. viii. 20, and xvii. 23; also קיווך "we have waited, or longed for Thee," in this form of construction

* We follow the Hebrew numeration.

peculiar to the Psalms, (see xxv. 5, xl. 2, cxxx. 5.) The expression *תאוה נפש* "desire of the soul," which comes in the same verse, is only to be found in Ps. x. 3. Verse 9 expresses the same thought as Ps. lxxvii. 7. We could then conclude that this canticle, making it end at v. 11, where there is a break in the text, was composed at the same time as the Psalms.

In the same style as the book before us, we could add, that the song could only refer to the destruction of the Idumæans by David and Joab, when every male was slaughtered, (3 Reg. xi. 15, 16); for the description of the "high cities" can only allude to the dwellings of that race. Therefore, this poem was composed in David's time.

But if, on the other hand, we wish to extend the compilation of the book of Jashar to a later period, or to decide its age by impartial judgment on documents bearing its impress, it would not be difficult to prove the phraseology of the passage before us to be perfectly that of Isaias, and the destruction of Edom alluded to, to be that which is described in Jeremias, xlix. 7—23, and which forms the exclusive topic of the beautiful prophecy of Abdias. And then, if this chapter be proved, by internal evidence to be Jasharan, that collection cannot have been complete earlier than the reign of Ezechias.

In enumerating Dr. Donaldson's reasons for ascribing his book to the period of Solomon, we passed over the one like an argument—the first. It is this: as we know the book of Jashar contained the lamentation of David over Saul and Jonathan, it cannot have been compiled before their death. This is true of the real and lost book of Jashar, but proves nothing for the collection which Dr. Donaldson calls by that name. It may be said; but the book of Josue, which likewise speaks of the book of Jashar, as containing that chieftain's address to the sun and moon, cannot have been written before the death of Saul. We reply by accepting the old and simple theory, that this collection, like "the books of days," or chronicles of kings, was made gradually, as inspired songs were spoken and admitted into it. And so the words of Josue were recorded in it, and it could be referred to by the writer of the book bearing his name, long before David mourned, and had his funeral song inscribed in the same record. This is a much simpler theory, and certainly

ore conformable with admitted doctrine, than Dr. Donaldson's.

But there is one objection to his whole scheme, which strikes us as obviously fatal, independent of its own total impracticability. If there existed a series of Hebrew poems collected, or even expressly composed, to instruct the Jewish people, that the inheritors of uprightness were to be faithful to God's law, and thereby happy, and prosperous,* there is one book which it appears strange should never have been excluded from it, or should not have so superseded it, as to have rendered such a compilation or composition unnecessary. On looking back over our marginal notes on the work we are reviewing, we find several times repeated such remarks as this, "why is not this attended to?" With one trifling exception,† it was not till page 328 that we found it referred to for the first and last time, in connection with our subject, and even then only in this transient remark, a parenthesis in fact. From the intimate connection which pious Israelites ought to have existed between the uprightness of God and the worldly happiness of upright men, which connection indeed that wonderful book of Job endeavours to vindicate, Solomon's contemporaries did not hesitate," &c. Hence the index of Scriptural passages referred to in the volume, there is not one from this book.

Now what, after all, is the drift and the gist of the book of Job? It is an example of what heathen philosophy considered the noblest spectacle that mankind could present to heaven, an honest and virtuous man struggling with misfortune, but not sinking under it. It is a vindication of God's "uprightness" in not allowing the "upright" to be overwhelmed, but giving him even temporal prosperity in return for his unflinching adherence to his "upright" course. The book exhibits a model of this peculiar virtue, far more striking than any selected for celebration in the book of Jashar, as imagined by Dr. Donaldson.

It describes the wonderful prosperity of a princely man,

* Hence Dr. Donaldson considers the verb *יָשַׁח* *isher*, the root of words meaning happiness, to be originally and radically identical with *יָשָׁר* *jashar*. (p. 21-24.)

† P. 75, where it is quoted to disprove the existence of Angels.

in early days, of one who dwelt not in tents, but whose children had separate households—whom yet the very first sentence of his book describes as “perfect,* and upright (*jashar*) and fearing God, and declining from evil.” There surely is no parallel to this character in the Old Testament, as to the peculiar virtue supposed to be celebrated in the book of Jashar. Nor is this enough: God gives him the same character twice, in presence of His heavenly court, and of Satan. (i. 8. ii. 3.) Surely this is enough to constitute him the very type of the “upright,” and determine the whole object of his history.

And this view is further confirmed, by the expressions of the book itself. To give two examples. In chapter iv. 7. Eliphaz says: “Remember, I pray, who that was innocent ever perished, or when was an upright man (*jashar*) cut off?” And Bildad (viii. 6): “If thou art innocent and *upright*, He would awaken to thee, and make peaceful the dwelling of thy *justice*.” The purport of the reasoning pursued by Job’s friends was, to show that affliction and suffering were proofs of wickedness; a reasoning confuted by the very issue of the history, and by the censure of the Almighty umpire in the dispute. (xlii. 7.)

Was it necessary to draw up a motley book of Jashar, such as Dr. Donaldson supposes, for a given purpose, while so full, so regular, so noble, so sublime a composition existed in Hebrew literature, not to speak of Hebrew theology? At any rate, we may ask, why did he not refer to this book, if at no other time, when he was endeavouring to define the meaning of Jashar? For here the word has its signification better defined than any where else. Three times the same explanation is given. “Perfect;” *תם* is the man “that fears God,” “upright,” *ישר* is he “who avoids wrong,” declining neither to right nor to left; as the “just,” *צדיק* is he who holds balanced level the scales, weighing all with impartial hand.

Shall we conjecture, that Job confutes too evidently the whole of the theory, whereon Dr. Donaldson bases his fiction of the book of Jashar, for it to have been promi-

* We use the word of the Anglican version. Here again we have a substantive corresponding well to the Hebrew word, but no adjective. *Integer*, complete, conveys its idea; *integrity* we have received into the language, but nothing more.

nently brought forward? For it describes a perfect specimen of the upright man, the Jashar, as a native of the land of Hus, that is of Edom; not an Israelite, but an alien, or rather something worse. According to our author's theory, one great purpose of the book of Jashar was, to record the exclusion of Edom, or the descendants of Esau from all participation in the blessings of the "Ecclesia Jasharana." (pp. 87. 122. seq.) Job clearly had nothing to do with the ritual or other specific institutions of the Jews, with their priesthood or sceptre, with their tabernacle or temple, with Moses or Solomon, with Sinai or Sion. Yet every high principle of Jasharism, if we may use the word, such as Dr. Donaldson has formulised it, is to be found in his history. Does not this overthrow the whole theory of its nature?

We have been, we fear, tediously long in discussing the very existence of the book of Jashar, according to Dr. Donaldson's conception of it. And yet we have got over only a small portion of our investigation. We must ask our reader patiently to go through the seven divisions of our author's imaginary book. It is only thus that the deleterious nature of his system can really be understood.

The first section contains two so-called fragments, the first consisting of Genesis i. 27, 28. vi. 1, 2, 4, 5. viii. 21. vi. 6 and 3. The second contains Gen. ii. 7-9, 15-18, and 25. iii. 1-19, 21, 23, 24.

Many of our readers will not at once understand the ground of this apparently capricious distribution of the first chapters of Genesis into two *fragments*. So far Dr. Donaldson's division is not original. It was, we believe, Prof. Eichhorn who first suggested, that the first chapters of Genesis were composed of two separate narratives, going over the same ground, and distinguishable by the circumstance that in one, God is called by this simple name, (Elohim) in the other He is called the Lord God (Jehovah Elohim). This view he originally put forward in 1790;* his theory modifying that of Astruc, who tore up Genesis into twelve different records interwoven together, and of Ilgen, who had reduced them to three. As, however,

* In Gabler's *Repertorium*; and more fully in his *Einleitung in das A. T.* vol. iii. 24 seqq. 3rd Ed.

it, at most, may suppose that Moses had access to older documents which he inserted into his history, it was adopted, among others, by the learned and good biblical critic and collector De Rossi of Parma, who wrote a dissertation in support of it, communicated to us, but never published. Taking up this same system, but differently applying it, Dr. Donaldson calls the supposed authors of these two sets of documents, the Elohist, and the Jehovist.

We may charitably suppose that he passes over the entire history of creation without intending thereby to reject it, but only wishing to begin with what he considers commenced the book of Jashar, the history of man. The two fragments comprehend this history, from the creation to the deluge, with a marked exclusion of all that relates to either. The names of Adam, of Eve, and of Noe are obviously avoided. The first is simply man, created without reference to other things; the verses containing the formation of the woman are omitted, though in clear sequence to what God says on the subject. Every allusion to Noe and the Deluge is omitted; so that when God, according to Scripture, Gen. vi. 7. said, "I will destroy man," &c., for these words is substituted v. 3, omitted in its right place; "my spirit shall not remain in man," &c. Why this transposition? Simply because Dr. Donaldson does not believe there ever was a deluge, or consequently a second father of the human race.

Over his history of the fall we must cast a veil; for we cannot venture even to give a vague or general account of his theory. Those who have curiosity to read it must go to the original. We can only say that if the Church of England can allow its sons and daughters to have Scripture expounded to them as the learned have it here; if on the one hand she desires every one to read this sacred book, and that with intelligence of its full and right sense, and if she expects every minister of hers to make this sense known to all under his care, and if further this, not only her minister, but one of her Doctors, complies with this duty in accordance with the system and phraseology of his book, we must conclude that there is an end to every claim on her part to be a guardian, we will not say of faith, but even of morals.*

* We are obliged therefore to decline the discussion of the

The explanation propounded by him supposes the entire history of man's fall to be an allegory, or in technical phraseology a *myth*. There was, of course, no serpent, no apple, no colloquy between the tempter and the tempted. The temptation was all from within, and St. Paul so explained it. This leads to a further, and important conclusion, which we must translate *in extenso*.

“ Relying on such an authority, we may confidently asseverate, that the whole source and substance of sin is exclusively in the depraved flesh or heart of man.... This doctrine we extract from the oldest fragments of the Pentateuch. This the Apostles proclaim. This Christ Himself pronounced, not by an obscure oracle, but candidly and openly, as was His wont. However there has stuck to the minds of many divines, those particularly least remarkable for learning and judgment, a certain opinion, or rather hallucination, that sin itself, and solicitation to offence do not flow from the interior of man, but are derived from elsewhere, and from without. For, they lay down, that before man was made, there existed some sublimer race of animals endowed with reason, whom they call *angels*; that they were *created* indeed, but *immortal*; incorporeal, but somehow that you know not, subject to concupiscence; that some of these sinned before man had sinned, and in a body had fallen off from God; that ever since they weary God Himself and man whom He made, by a perpetual war. [They assert] that Beelzebub, their prince, having assumed the body of a serpent, persuaded Eve to eat the forbidden fruit; that the same to our days suggest to each man whatever of evil thought insinuates itself into our minds; nay that he solicited Jesus Christ, to renounce his office, and vow obedience to him, the apostate and rebel. This is that doctrine which our John Milton commended, not to say consecrated by his genius; which if you go against, there are even as yet among our doctors, some who would think you were knocking out their brains. But even, if you grant that there are to be found some passages of doubtful authority, some metaphors or

philological assertions by which this system is supported; though some of them are most rash and untenable. The violence done to the word *אָרַב* the heel (*a kibe*) is atrocious. Let us make two remarks on it, 1. That not only the very word occurs twice in the Jasharan writings, but both times with the same idea commonly joined to it here, that of laying in wait to bite it, (Gen. xlix. 17. 19.) in one instance *at least* with the figure of a serpent. 2. The reference made to a verse in Jeremias to support the new meaning is of no value; because that passage may be even explained as Dr. D. wishes, by an euphemism, such as the Keri suggests on Is. xxxvi. 12.

accommodations of words, and parabolic narratives of events, which may seem to favour, to a certain extent, this opinion, you must nevertheless contend, that it is perniciously repugnant to the whole design of Scripture, and the clearest words of Christ and His Apostles."—P. 65.

We should think few plain and simple-minded readers of Scripture can fail to be astounded, which is akin to being stunned, or having one's brains tolerably knocked about, on reading this passage. And though the strong expressions at the end directly refer to the existence of evil spirits, that molest man in the spiritual life, yet it is plain from the beginning of the extract, that the whole race of angels is excluded from the Jasharan theology. Indeed subsequent assertions of its author will prove this.

But he proceeds to give several arguments, by which, he says, "it will be sufficient if he briefly puts to flight the whole system." The first argument is, that only God can act directly on the spiritual part of man. Any other spirit must act therefore through the senses. If an evil one could act directly upon the soul, he would usurp the power of God. "Therefore the pretended devil ('*Diabolus ille quem perhibent*') does not act directly and immediately on the soul of the sinner." If on the other hand he incorporates himself with the limbs and flesh of man, and so stimulates inferior appetites, then he loses all personality, and no distinction exists between him and the flesh. It is not therefore a spiritual being that tempts. "And than this conclusion," our author winds up, "there is not a more certain demonstration in Euclid." (p. 67.) The decision of this point we leave to Cambridge. There occurs however an illustration of the argument, which runs as follows. "When St. Paul, writing about some infirmity of his, says 'there was given to me a sting of the flesh, an angel of Satan, who should buffet me,' (2 Cor. xii. 7,) it is clear that he, with the rest of the Jews, attributed to a spiritual malignity of some sort, even corporeal disorders, the origin of which was not yet discovered. And yet we know, that all these have their seat only in the nerves of the body." Is not this rather a buffet for St. Paul? It is telling him that, after having been up to the third heaven, and heard the mysterious wisdom, which God alone speaks, he came down again so ill instructed in doctrine, as to believe in the existence of evil spiritual

influences, as the Jews did, and so deserve to be classed by Dr. Donaldson, Head Master of Bury St. Edmund's school, and ex-Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, among those divines "who are least endowed with learning and judgment;" for his youngest scholar, instructed by him, could have informed the heaven-taught Doctor of the Gentiles, that the seat of *his* disease (if he spoke of one) was in his nervous system, and had nothing to do with the imaginary being in whose existence he manifestly believed. It is some comfort however for us to have such a companion, in the censure of the modern Doctor of gentilism.

His second argument is that the Scripture recognises no tempting power except what resides in man himself; that "the world, the flesh and the devil" are not three, but one, represented under three forms, and mean only the incentives to sin that exist in our own hearts; that the "wicked one, the tempter, and finally the devil" of the New Testament signify only our own passions; while "the Prince of this world" (Jo. xiv. 30.) receives a very shady definition. (p. 69.) Our Lord said to His disciples, "I will not now speak many things with you; for the Prince of this world cometh, and in me he hath not anything." If we substitute Dr. Donaldson's fuller exposition of the phrase, the text will run as follows: "I will not now speak many things to you: for 'a certain notion of mundane wickedness distinct from matter but personified, a type, appearance, and idea of something which exists in all, but cannot exist in a separate state,' cometh, and in me he hath not anything."

Now this must have been a moving allegory, a walking phantasy, which our Lord saw coming towards Himself and His disciples. If it was habitually there "in all," or at any rate had been there most of the evening in Judas, He could not well have seen it now coming, so as to cut short His discourse. How could it be a thing that "cannot exist in a separate state," if it was coming; an action completely *ab extra*? But finally, and most painfully, how could our Saviour say, "and in Me he hath nothing?" if Dr. Donaldson's third argument be any thing but a blasphemous heresy?

We approach the subject most reluctantly, and will content ourselves with translating his words. For the world

must know what doctrine is now being openly taught in the Anglican religious Establishment. Thus he writes.

“But I proceed to prove that the Saviour Himself was not exposed to other solicitations to sin, than those which naturally result from the flesh of man. I pass over the temptation in the wilderness. Every one must see that by that narration, Jesus described with what dangerous thoughts He wrestled, before He entered on His office of teaching, joined to the exercise of a heavenly power.”—P. 70.

After discussing several texts, one of which “every interpreter as far as he knows has hitherto misunderstood,” he gives the following objection and answer.

“But some one will say: how could Jesus put off a *sinful* flesh? Was He not without sin? Is the 25th Article of the Anglican Church false, which declares” (that He was exempt from sin in the flesh as in the spirit)? “The answer to such a question need not be sought; for unless we deny, (which would be heretical) that Jesus Christ has so assumed human nature that the two natures, the human and the divine, were entirely and perfectly joined inseparably in oneness of person, of which is one Christ, true God and true man,’ (Art. 2) we must acknowledge, that the same Christ, as man, was subject to those troublesome thoughts, which minister allurements to sin. This is declared by the temptations which He underwent. But as He was perfect God, it could not be, but that He subjected to Himself all matter of sin. In Him, as in the rest of men, struggled the *flesh* and the *spirit*; (1 Pet. iii. 18) but as He was God-man, ‘and appeared that He might take away sin,’ He was easily victorious, and ‘in Him there was no sin.’”—P. 71.

We will only remark, that exactly the contrary doctrine has been ever held in the Church; that our most Blessed Lord could not be tempted from within, but only from without. We cannot indeed be surprised that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception should be unintelligible, where there is so little sense of the personal holiness of our Lord.

If evil spirits are so unceremoniously got rid of, we may perhaps expect good angels to be treated with better courtesy. This, however, is far from being the case. According to Dr. Donaldson, as other oriental nations worshipped the heavenly bodies, the Israelites seem to have compromised for their propensity to this idolatry, by imagining them to be living beings, “an army or chorus,

that executed Jehova's behests, or sung His praises." (p. 75.) This is illustrated by several texts, in which the stars, for example, are invited to praise the Lord. "With which you may compare the vision of Isaias, (vi.) who thinks it right to commit the triple salutation of the Divinity to those body-guards, who either bore or surrounded God's throne."

These images relate to the representation, by symbols, of God's invisible majesty: when the Jews wished to describe the exercise of His invisible power, they used as their images more atmospheric phenomena. Winds and clouds form the winged car on which an angry God rides. But the Jews treated the clouds as the car, rather than as the messengers of God, (differently from the Hindoos): for these latter are what we, by a Persian name, call Angels. "That these angels were nothing more than wind and lightning, which are intimately connected with the clouds, is demonstrated by the classical passage in Psalm civ. 4." Then as the rainbow is like a bridge between earth and heaven, it is not surprising that the Jews should have taken it to be the causeway to the heavenly courts, (*Bethel*) and imagined it to be a ladder, up and down which God's ministers passed. (p. 76.) "Since therefore by Angels they meant, not beings endowed with reason, but winds and lightnings," (did they imagine that these went up and down the rainbow?) "they distinguished the violence and assault of these two elements which served God, by proper names. The *winds* indeed they called *Cherubs*, and the *lightning Seraphs*. Each designation is most apt for signifying its object." After quoting passages well-known to all, where God is described as riding on the Cherubim and on the winds, he proceeds, as usual with him, to etymological disquisitions. We will content ourselves with that on the Cherubim.

"The very etymology of the word כְּרֻב (cherub) agrees wonderfully with this signification. For the Sanscrit root *grabh*, Gr. ἀπν-αζω, Lat. *rapio*, Goth. *greip-an*, which occurs not only in this word, but in its synonymes γρῦπ-ς, κερβ-ερος, ἀπν-υια, excellently describes the rapid force of the wind carrying everything off."—P. 77.

We hardly remember to have read, in any German commentator, a piece of philology more extraordinary. A cursory reader would take it for granted, that the etymo-

logy of Hebrew, or Semitic, words, is to be ordinarily sought in Sanscrit and German, or Indo-Germanic roots. The two names, Cherub and Seraph are a pair of words, descriptive of a purely Jewish idea. Cherub more especially is such ; for it is never used simply for "wind," but always in conjunction with God. We never read that "the Cherub blew," or that there was a "high Cherub." This was reserved for modern art to represent, after heraldic and funereal cherubs had been reduced to nothing but puffy cheeks and wings. Well, is it credible that the Jews should have got from a strange family of languages the name for this exclusive symbol, and formed from a purely domestic source the other name, which might possibly be ambiguous?

But let us see the etymology. For the sake of inexperienced readers we must observe, that in tracing etymologies, first, only consonants are cared for, and secondly consonants of the same organ are easily exchanged. Still some specific analogy ought to exist between the derivative and its proposed origin. Having asserted that a Cherub is only a wind, or a storm, and offered to prove, or at least confirm this, from etymology, and having travelled even to another ethnographic family for his evidence, the author may reasonably be expected to bring us thence words analogous in letters, which mean a wind, or a tempest, or an aerial phenomenon of some sort. Instead of this we have a set of verbs, descriptive of one only of the properties of the wind. Nor does that quality exclusively or peculiarly belong to it ; nay, it belongs as well to a torrent, or an army, or a wild beast, or a thief, or a miser, or a tyrant, or banditti. For the words cited mean not, to blow, nor to be boisterous, nor to agitate, nor to root up, nor to collect clouds, nor in fact anything more or less than to snatch and carry off. In fact the familiar English *grab*, is the same as the more solemn Sanscrit, shorn of its final unpronounceable aspirate : to *gripe* comes nearer to the supposed root than the Gothic *greip-an*, having no *An-hang* after it ; and the Persian گرفتن *gerif-tan* to take hold, grasp, or the Latin *carpo* belongs to the same family.

But more extraordinary than all, is the very unpleasant connection into which the CHeRuB-im are etymologically brought by Dr. Donaldson, when he declares their name

to be a synonyme of CeRB-erus, GRyP-s (a griffin), and the HaRP-ies. The capitals will shew the frame-work of the words, and their coincidences. The natural conclusion to which the reader should come from this assertion is, that if the common root of all these words be such as obliges one of its derivatives, *eo ipso* to signify the wind, and they are all its synonymes, all these words also mean the same. So that Cerberus, Gryps and Harpy, being deduced from the Sanscrit *Grabh*, all mean either one or several winds, or sorts of storms. Otherwise they are no synonymes of Cherub.

We are not, however, yet come to an end. God placed Cherubim to guard the gate of paradise; which means, according to our author, that wind and fire shut up all access to God, for us mortals. "So among oriental nations these symbols" (that is fire and storms) "which are called by various words, if not of the same origin, of the same signification, Cherubim, Cerb-erus, Grypes, Sphinxes, perhaps called by the Egyptians *Kerabu*,*—guard all hidden, mystic and secret things, treasures, temples, sepulchres, palaces, the regions below, and the palaces of heaven." (p. 78.) Here the Harpies have disappeared, but the Sphynxes have taken their places; unfortunately without any Œdipus to explain, how they have got among the cognates of *Grabh*. It now, therefore, appears that the analogy between the Cherubim and profane mythic animals is in their guardianship of mysterious things and places. We think CHaRyB-dis, that storm of water which guards the gold-island of Sicily, has a right to enter into this class as well as the Sphinxes. Or really, to show to what lengths such fanciful etymologies, and word-play may be carried, we might gravely assert, that we find a great analogy between other animals of monstrous form, or mystical attributes, and the Cerbero-grypic family. It is in crustaceous animals, armed with forceps-shaped claws, admirably formed for GRiPing, GRasPing,

* If *Kerabu* be an Egyptian word for a compound animal called a Sphiux, and Dr. D. finds an analogy in it to Cherub, how can he derive this from Sanscrit? Has *Kerabu* anything to do with winds and storms? Let him stick to one or the other etymology: not give the one as certain, then throw out to us another, and an incompatible one.

and doing all comprised under the idea of the Sanscrit GRaBH. Such are the CRaB, the sCoRP-ion, and the sCaRaBeus, or large sacred Egyptian beetle, a sort of which Pliny tells us, has serrated claws (or chelæ) like the other two.* We think, moreover, that the original etymology of all such words from winds might have been improved by such additions as CaRB-as, a wind mentioned by Vitruvius as blowing from the East, and CaRB-asus, by-the-bye a Hebrew word borrowed by the Greeks, (καρπας) a sail filled by the wind. We do not, however pretend to reconcile this first etymology with the subsequent description of the duties of our rapacious though sacred animals. For, winds and storms pursue a destructive and uprooting policy, while Cerberus, Griffins, and Sphinxes are eminently conservative; and we cannot understand, how the often repeated "synonymes" derive their meaning from violent snatching away (ἀρπάζω and *rapio*) yet signify the guardians of things which others wish to carry off, or must not approach.

To conclude this lengthy discussion, we will say, that if any analogy offered itself to the mind of Dr. Donaldson between the Cherubim, and those other symbols, it should have been that these were supposed to represent entities, not imaginings, that they all were thought to have an unearthly form, though composed of earthly forms, two of them compounded from various animals, the same as are attributed to the Cherub. This is a strong analogy, and one more truthful, together with their custodiant duties, than an attempted connection of all these beings or shapes with the wind, through an insufficient foreign etymology.

But were the Cherubim which, with outstretched wings, formed the mercy-seat of the Tabernacle, symbols of storm and angry judgment, and not also of forgiveness and kindness?

Before, however, leaving this subject, let us plainly look in the face of the influence on the New Testament, of Dr. Donaldson's theory. He denies totally the existence of Angels, good or bad. Putting aside therefore the important part which they bear in the older dispensation, let us

* "In quodam genere eorum grandi, cornua prælonga, bisulcis dentata forcipibus in cacumine, cum libuit ad morsum coëuntibus." H. N. xi.

ask, was there no such a being as an Angel engaged in announcing the Incarnation to Mary, or in ordering Joseph to fly into Egypt; or in ministering to our Lord in the wilderness, or in comforting Him in His agony, or watching His tomb after His Resurrection, or consoling the disciples on His ascension; or in freeing Peter from prison? Were all the agents in these events called Angels in the narration of them, ordinary men, or freaks of imagination, or symbolical inventions of the narrator, or an electrical light, or vapour, or opportune physical phenomena? If so, where has the Gospel given us the key to so important a secret? Not surely in philological and etymological discoveries of the omniscient nineteenth century. Again, when our Redeemer spoke of the Angels of His little ones, did He speak astrologically, and mean their stars? Or on so many other occasions, when He named Angels as seeing God, as rejoicing with Him on the penance of sinners, as resenting scandals, or as separating the good from the bad, at the end of the world; or when He spoke of His heavenly Father as having legions of them ready to send to His rescue, if He wished it, did He mean anything real, explicable by the *usus loquendi*; or are all these, fanciful tropes, manners of speaking, religious imagery; and are Angels mere nobodies, unexistences, in one word, fictions? Does Dr. Donaldson stick through the New Testament, to his theory in the Old, that Angels are only the *Host* of heaven visible to the eyes, captained by planets, and officered by brighter constellations? How were these to be sent forth, to meet the Roman and Jewish satellites? Was it to be merely by their combined sidereal influence that they were to act, and render planet-struck the already demented counsellors of Israel? Or shall a profane imagination be tempted to fancy a squadron of shooting stars detached from the firmament, under the lead of Sagittarius himself, loosened from the golden zone of heaven, for a more material warfare?

But enough on this subject, which could be much further pursued, especially by reference to those passages, in which the excellence of our divine Lord is enhanced by comparison with the prerogatives of Angels, and His ministry in the New Law is contrasted with theirs in the promulgation of the Old. On what remains to be done in our limited space, we shall endeavour to be less diffuse.

We will content ourselves, and we trust our readers, with simply stating Dr. Donaldson's views, offering only brief remarks. If we have gone more fully hitherto into purely philological discussions, it has partly been to remove the impression which a display of exotic erudition too often makes, in favour of error. Seeing a paradox, or an infidel opinion maintained with great positiveness, by an appeal to words in strange characters, and transmutations of mysterious letters, the reader presumes that there must be something, if not a good deal in all that. Let us assure him that in general, a little sifting of this erudition will give the same proportion of scorix and metal as the Cherubic theory.

The second part of the book of Jashar is made to begin as follows :

Fragment I.

"Gen. ix. 18. [Adam (that is man) after that from Eden] he went out, had three sons, Sem, Cham and Japhet. But Cham was the father of Chanaan.

v. 19. The descendants of these were spread over the whole world.

v. 20. And [Adam i. e. man] began agriculture, and planted the vine.

v. 21. And having drunk wine he was inebriated," &c. To the end of the blessing of Sem and Japhet.—P. 81.

Thus begins Fragment II.

"Gen. iv. 2 [And Sem begot two sons, Cain the elder] And Abel his brother." And so on to v. 7, when the text thus continues : ["But to Abel Jehovah said,"]

[Gen. xxii. 15.] Because thou hast done this thing and hast believed in me,

[Gen. xv. 7.] Behold I have reckoned it to thee unto justice,

[Gen. xxvii. 29.] Hence thou shalt be thy brother's master, v. 7. And his appetite shall be under you."—P. 83.

Thus opens Fragment III.

["And Abraham, the son of Abel, took to wife his relation Sara.] Gen. xvi. 1. But Sara, the wife of Abraham, bore him no children," &c.—P. 83.

The third fragment gives the history of Jacob's obtaining the primogeniture and the father's blessing belonging to his brother Esau. In the narrative of the latter event, the verses mentioning Jacob's covering his hands, with the kid-skins, and the father's examining him are omitted. But at the end comes the following strange interpolation :

“[Then Esau became a Cinite, i. e. אִישׁ קַיִן (ish Kain)
a man of the spear,
And he was called not as before ‘Esau the son of
Isaac,’

Gen. iv. 18. But he was called Lamech the son of Mathusaleh.

He therefore after he had left the society of his father,

ver. 19. Took to wife *Ada* daughter of Elon the Chittite also
called *Judith*

xxvi. 34. } And *Tsilla* daughter of Ana the Chivvite, also called
xxxvi. 2. } *Oholibama*.

When therefore he had got a sword and lance,

He thus sang boastingly to his wives]

Gen. iv. 23. *Ada* and *Tsilla*,” &c., to the end of v. 24.

“Gen. xxxvi. 8. [Therefore Lamech, who is also Esau, dwelt in
Mount Seir, among the Cinites and Agarenes.
Seeking his food by violence, arms, and plunder.]

Gen. xxviii. 9. There besides the wives whom he already had.
he took also *Machalatha*, who was the daughter
of *Ismael*, the son of *Abraham*,” &c.

The reader will easily perceive that Dr. Donaldson attaches very little value to the early genealogies of Scripture. In fact he tells us so. “Whatever the case may be, it is certain that either the first or the second genealogy (Gen. v. x.) is false and supposititious.” (p. 105.) “Henry Ewald has sufficiently demonstrated that not only the two genealogies which precede, but the third which follows, the deluge, were made up arbitrarily by their writers.” (p. 106.) Accordingly Dr. D. has as much right to draw up a new one, which the authorities of his religion allow him to teach to the youth of their establishment, presenting, among others, the following features.

Adam was the father of Sem, Cham and Japhet.

Abraham was the son of Abel,

And the father of Lamech, who was the same as Esau.

And this is called expounding the Holy Bible!

The reader is probably somewhat bewildered at this inversion of things; and may ask, what has become of Cain and Abel, of Noe, and others?

As to those two brothers, their history is this;—simply they never existed. They are two ethnographical myths and nothing else. For nothing does Dr. Donaldson more contend than for the theory, that Abraham was the son of Abel, yet they were one person. At least we can make nothing better out of it. 1. We are told that “from the

etymology of the name of Abel...it is clear that not Adam, but Sem was the father of Abel. Nor is it difficult to explain how this name got interpolated among the children of Adam." (p. 105.) An etymology on one side, Scripture on the other. A Catholic at least will prefer the latter. In fragment the third, we have seen Abraham distinctly called "the son of Abel." 2. From the Epistle to the Hebrews and St. Matthew, it appears that in the first century after Christ, there was something in the text of Genesis, which attributed Abel's sacrifice to faith, and so identified it with that of Abraham, that, "if we had no other argument, from this alone we might conclude, that Abel and Abraham are to be referred to the same category in the religious history of the Jews." (p. 111.) Is it the category of myths, or symbols? "This being the case, what prevents our picking out of Abraham's history those words which suffice to restore the passage?" (Those introduced from Gen. xxii. and xv.) Surely every thing, unless Abel and Abraham were one, in reality or in fiction. 3. "We have seen that the name of Abel designated not so much Abraham himself, as Abraham's pious family." (p. 115.) If the reader have made out who or what was Abel, we envy his power of discernment. To us he appears to be, Abraham's father, Abraham himself, and Abraham's son.

Then was he not murdered by his brother Cain? Nothing of the sort. The whole history is an allegory, thus explained by our commentator. The Cinites, or Kinæans were the descendants of Cain, (of course the deluge is not supposed to break the descent) and whatever they may have done cruelly against the Jews, or Abelites, at an earlier period, they repented, and befriended them as they passed through the desert. Like the ideal Cain, who also repented, they had their sentence of death, incurred in common with other Canaanite tribes, commuted into that of perpetual banishment, and wandering in the desert. God, to save them from the vengeance of His people on meeting them, set a sign on them, which was that they should live apart from the Amalekites in Arabia; so that when Saul exterminated the latter, he expressly spared the first. And so ends the history of Cain and Abel, with all the illustrations drawn from it, as real, by Christ and His Apostles. For if you ask Dr. Donaldson, how our Lord could speak of "the blood of Abel the

just," as really shed, (Mat. xxiii. 25,) he coolly answers you, "that it was not the office of Jesus Christ to examine, according to critical rules all the traditions of the Jews." (p. 112.)

As to Abraham himself we have further only to observe, that he had two names; one historical, Abram, which "when he turns into an ethnographic person," (or character) "is prolonged into Abraham." (p. 116.)

In reading the history of Isaac and Abraham it is clear that they have got so mixed up, "that one may rightly doubt, whether we are reading the actions of one man or of two, or not rather the traditions of the tribe over which both ruled." (p. 120.) On what St. Paul writes about Ismael's persecution of Isaac, (Gal. iv. 29,) Dr. Donaldson makes this remark; "I see that the apostle, in treating of this passage has indulged his fancy very freely, and has granted to allegorizing interpreters of Scripture who have flourished after him, ample liberty to dare anything." (p. 119.)

Passing over the etymological researches about Esau, otherwise Lamech, which latter name turns out to be Greek, so that the history of him who bore it cannot have been composed till the times of the Cretan mercenaries, researches which we think will be valued low by those who will study them, we pass to the deluge. But like one who should have been long absent from a place where a vast lake or morass covered a wide extent of land, and on returning finds it, to his astonishment, drained dry, so will the reader be, if, standing on what he has considered till now the high ground of revelation, he expects to see, in a biblical exposition of Genesis written by an Anglican D.D. the account or commemoration of the great Flood. It has disappeared; drawn off, out of all existence, by the geological perforations, and shafts, or drunk up at the annual meetings and trips of scientific investigation. The question in the mouths of such writers is, "give up either the Bible or the Deluge. Science won't let you have both." And it is the same with creation by days. The time is come for faith to bring its peace-offering to the altar of research. The mighty power has its huge steam-hammer raised up; it asks for two victims at least, in acknowledgment of its supremacy, the Mosaic records of the beginning, and those of the renovation, of the world, its birth and its baptism. In the last century men reasoned differently. They took the

Bible as a whole, a unity, by which they must stand or fall. The Voltairian infidel in all the pride of nascent science exclaimed; "the Mosaic records of creation are disproved by young geology and old astronomy; the stratifications of lava in Sicily, and the zodiacs in Egyptian temples prove them out of joint and out of date. The very foundations of your whole scriptural system are gone; your fabric totters; lay your biblical simplicity at the feet of science, blaspheme God, and die." Christians then, in the confidence of faith, recoiled from the terrible alternative. They bid science walk on, and explore the earth and its depths, the heavens and their heights to its heart's content; but be sure that it would be able to forge no new weapon against that teaching of God, which had stood the rudest tests.

They were right. We doubt if one of those boasted facts, discoveries, or calculations, on the strength of which Christians were summoned to surrender their faith in Scripture, would now be admitted as true, by men of science. They would say; if the science of the last century had nothing better to claim abjuration of Christianity upon than these facts, it could make out but a poor case. Now, however, things are altered. Science asks only for a compromise, a barter. "Give me," it says, "up creation and the flood, and I will compound for the rest. I will allow you a refracting atmosphere for Josue and Ezechias; and a high tide with a north wind will get you through the Red Sea." Some divines of the Anglican system are preparing themselves for the bargain. They will dismember the Bible, and throw limb after limb to the Moloch that pursues them. We, for our parts, stand firm. We will not give up an atom of revealed truth; convinced as we are that it is readily harmonised with all certain science.

We have indulged in these remarks, somewhat at length, because we believe that this compromise with infidelity is gaining ground. We will give one evidence of it. On the last day of May, this year, what is called the leading Journal had an article on the unpractical character of Anglican preaching. The next day the following letter appeared in its columns.

“TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

“Sir,—In your paper of to-day, I, in common, I doubt not, with a large number of your readers, perused with deep interest some admirable remarks on the general character of the preaching in our national churches, called forth by the recent charge of Arch-deacon Sinclair. You justly adverted to the wide field open for usefulness in a more explanatory and enlightening kind of instruction than that so often dispensed from the pulpit.

“I cannot avoid alluding to an actual case of recent occurrence, which offers a somewhat striking comment on your remarks, and, I fear, a too obvious justification for the un instructive and routine nature of the discourses of which you so justly complain.

“If there be one topic more than another which in the present state of information, especially among the educated classes, may call for some consideration at the hands of the clergy (indeed, you have intimated as much), it is surely that furnished by the advances made in science, and their real or apparent bearing on religion. One of the most striking instances of this kind, is the discrepancy between the discoveries of geology and the Mosaic narration of the creation. Now, Sir, on Septuagesima Sunday last (when the proper lesson is Gen. i.) I happened to be present at a church in the north-west portion of the metropolis, and heard a discourse, of which I will say no more than that it placed that very material question in a light in which I believe every enlightened and serious inquirer would rejoice to see it explained, including a recognition of the scientific facts, and a full admission of their irreconcilable contradiction to the narrative, coupled with the most earnest assertion of the truth of the New Testament dispensation, and its entire independence of any such representations belonging to the Old.

“Now, Sir, what was the consequence? It would seem that some of the congregation entertained very opposite ideas to those you have so ably upheld. Instead of appreciating such instruction (a little out of the beaten track it must be owned), certain bigotted individuals took the gentlemanlike course of turning informers, and denouncing the sermon to the Bishop of London. I should mention that the preacher was not the regular minister, but a friend who occasionally assisted him. The sermon not being hidden by an almsdish like the crucifix at St. Bennet's, the bishop could not ignore it; and the incumbent, having the fear of his pewrents before his eyes, of course declined further enlightenment for his flock!

“I could give further particulars, but have, I believe, said enough to warrant the question, whether this occurrence and the spirit it indicates, encouraged, too, by the rulers of the Church, may not fully account for the prevalence of ‘the black tape system’ which you so admirably expose?

“I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

“June 1.

PHILELEUTHEROS.’

Here is a case in point. From an Anglican pulpit the cosmogony of Moses is proved to be contrary to geological discoveries, is rejected; and yet christianity is shown to be totally independent of the Old Testament. This is sacrificing more even than we should have thought demanded.

To return, however, to Dr. Donaldson's view of the deluge. According to him the scripture narrative of this event is nothing more than an allegorical description of the various fortunes of the Jewish people, till the time of Solomon, who is meant by the name of Noe, or "rest." (p. 140.) His scriptural account begins thus—

"Gen. vi. 6. When the whole earth lay overwhelmed by the waters of the deluge,

"But Israel walked uprightly and religiously," &c.—p. 133.

The Ark was the Ark of the Covenant; the crow sent out represents the scouts who discouraged the people, the dove those who encouraged it on its march towards peace.

This is the only view of the flood which the book of Jashar took. There is another, a historical one. It is probable that some early people going from Armenia to Asia Minor, were overtaken by a sudden rising of rivers in a muddy alluvial plain; that many were drowned, and a few escaped with their cattle in a boat, or more probably along a chain of hills. A third remains, which Dr. Donaldson considers confirms his view. It is that taught by those "præstantissimi duumviri Paulus et Petrus." St. Paul of course is named first. The reasoning by which our author proves that the Apostolic illustrations of baptism, drawn from the deluge coincides with his theory, that there never was a deluge, is a rare specimen of logic. According to one Apostle baptism was symbolised by the deluge, (1 Pet. iii. 20,) according to the other the same Sacrament was typified by the Exodus. "Now two things which agree with a third must necessarily agree with one another. *Ergo*, if nothing more, according to these authors, there is some connection between the deluge and the Exodus." (p. 143.) This appears to our simple apprehension much the same reasoning as the following. Our Saviour says He was symbolised by Jonas in the whale's belly, (Mat. xii. 37,) and also that He was typified by the brazen serpent in the desert. (Jo. iii. 14.) "*Ergo*, if nothing more, there is some connection between the brazen

serpent and the prophet in his unpleasant situation." It so happens however that St. Paul's typification of baptism is not in the mere Exodus, but in the passing through the Red Sea. (1 Cor. x. 1.) This does really give us a triple analogy, in the water common to all three, Baptism, the Red Sea, and the Flood. Surely Dr. Donaldson's eyes must be open to the clear evidence, that the only similarity between the three consists in this common element, and that St. Peter never meant *his* dry deluge, his symbolical flood, to represent baptism. And then what becomes of that solemn warning of our Lord, "as in the days of Noe...the day in which Noe entered into the Ark," &c. (Mat. xxiv. 37, 38,) which He applies to His own coming? Does He compare His own last coming to judge the world to what never was? to a fable? to a stupid false tradition? Surely men would have little to fear, if Dr. Donaldson's opinion about Noe were true; viz., that he never was, except as a synonyme to Solomon.

The third part of Jashar consists of three extracts from Deuteronomy, containing moral precepts. This will not delay us much; as we will only note a few passages.

1. Quoting or rather giving Deut. vi. 5, he adds in a note. "The levitical compiler here thrust in some mention of the sedition of Core," &c.: (omitted therefore by Dr. Donaldson.) "The original poem however only commemorated," &c. (p. 155.) A similar omission, of an order to exterminate other nations, is made. (p. 157.)

2. Deuteronomy is the only book of the Pentateuch which seems to find much favour in our author's eyes. "The books themselves, as exhibiting divine laws differ in this, that Exodus and Leviticus direct the attention to rites rather and ceremonies, to formulas and notes, *such as a College of priests might invent.*" (p. 159.)

3. Before the reign of Ezechias there was only one book of the law known, that of Jashar. Micheas who flourished in that reign quotes it, but also quotes Deuteronomy. Somehow or other, it seems that these were one and the same book, if we understand Dr. Donaldson right; though we are not sure of this. At any rate, it is the universal doctrine of the prophets from Samuel to Jeremias, nay to the compiler of the books of Kings, who lived at least forty years after the beginning of the captivity, that God did not wish to be honoured by sacrifices; consequently He had instituted none. It fol-

lows that the books of the Pentateuch, which are filled with precepts about ritual worship, were written after this latest period. Indeed our author boldly asserts, that till after the captivity no Jewish sacred book existed, except Jashar, and some way or other, to us not clear, Deuteronomy, or parts thereof. (pp. 158-162.)

4. Christ our Lord knew no other book of the so-called Pentateuch. On this most important subject, we must content ourselves with translating one or two sentences. "He neglected in life the laws about sacrifices, rites and ceremonies, not recognizing them, and abrogating them by His death." (p. 163.) Did He not order the lepers whom He cleansed, to go to the priests and offer up the gifts prescribed in Leviticus? Did He not eat the Pasch, with reverence, and make it His own symbol? And was not this shown to St. John, in the form of a Lamb lying as slain on the heavenly altar? What did He mean by saying: "if thou hast laid thy gift upon the altar, &c... return and offer up thy gift?" (Mat. v. 23.) if He considered sacrifices as mere superstitions, and modern inventions, how could He command, in this case, to return, and offer up the gift? But one of the passages just referred to deserves a further remark. Jesus told the leper, to "show himself to the priests *and offer the gift which Moses commanded.*" (Ib. viii. 4.) Now the offering of this gift is not enjoined in Deuteronomy, but in Leviticus. (xiv. 2.) Our Lord therefore reckons this among the books of Moses, not among the inventions of sacerdotal colleges after the captivity. By-the-bye this idea is not new; for many years ago it was asserted in Germany, that these books and those of Kings must have been written when the priests had it all their own way, that is in the days of the Machabees. And so admitted was this conclusion, that Gesenius in his Essay on the Samaritan Pentateuch, which we have not at hand, boldly decides that it was not translated before a very late period, simply because it was not composed earlier.* But to return.

* Even Eichhorn, however, learnedly proves that all the Pentateuch was the work of Moses, with trifling additions by his contemporaries. He shows particularly that the language is too archaic to belong to the period of David and Solomon, to which Dr. Donald-

Then surely, if Christ, by His death abrogated the ancient sacrifices, He thereby recognized their lawful existence, and their typical meaning. He cannot be thought to have given His own life, as a sacrifice which only took the place of spurious inventions of a hypocritical priesthood, forgers of heavenly credentials, nor to have converted these into foreshadowings of His own priceless offering. He showed indeed contempt for the traditional corruptions of the law, their Pharisaical washings, and Sabbatarian superstition; but He clearly recognized the rites and institutions of the Pentateuch as divine.

But what shall we say of the entire drift of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which is to prove, by contrast, not by rejection, the superiority of Christ's priesthood over that of Aaron, and of His oblation above that of the Law? In every line almost of the book are the prescriptions of Leviticus and Exodus alluded to. The election of Aaron (v. 4.), the consecrations by sacrifices and sprinklings with blood and scarlet wool and hyssop (ix. 19.), the offering of goats and calves (12.), the daily oblation (vii. 27. x. 11.), the yearly entry of the High-priest into the Sanctuary (ix. 7.), all the parts, utensils, and rites of the Tabernacle as described in Exodus (ix. 1. seqq.), are distinctly not only admitted, but made the groundwork of the conclusion that "the Law having a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image of the things, by the self-same sacrifices which they offer every year, can never make the comers thereunto perfect; for then they would have ceased to be offered: ...but this Man offering one sacrifice for sins, for ever sitteth on the right hand of God" (x. 1-12.).

It seems an act of blindness or insanity to assert, that Our Lord, or the New Testament, ignored the ancient sacrifices and ritual as a part of the Theo-Mosaic law.

Further, Christ, according to Dr. Donaldson, when "He thinks it worth while to appeal by express quotation to the law of Moses, never quoted (*laudavit*) the ritual books, but *thought Deuteronomy alone* (the book) to be quoted, as *the sole authority*. Thus *when He describes to His disciples* in what a conflict of mind and thought

son attributes the compilation of the book of Jashar. (*Ubi sup.*) It is lamentable to find a professed German rationalist more orthodox than an Anglican divine.

He contended, when approaching His office of publicly teaching and working miracles, He thrice quotes Deuteronomy, as giving help and comfort." (p. 163.) We merely interrupt the text to call attention to this rash and sacrilegious perversion of the Gospels. Our Lord is never said to have told the disciples His thoughts, but His temptations are described as events; He did not quote the three texts to His disciples, as comforting, but to the Evil one as confuting. We proceed with the Doctor's text. "And when He quotes the first and second commandments, which embrace the sum of law and prophets, He had in view only Deuteronomy, *although the latter part of His quotation occurs casually (obiter) in Leviticus.* (Mat. xxii. 37-40. s. l.)" Our author then has thus undertaken to prove that Christ, in delivering moral precepts, *never* refers to the ritual books, but *always* to Deuteronomy. Yet in the only illustration with which he favours us, Our Saviour gives two commandments as of equal authority; "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart" from Deuteronomy (vi. 5.), and "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" from Leviticus (xix. 18.)! Is Dr. Donaldson really in earnest? From his own solitary example, he ought to have deduced that the two books were of equal standing and authority in our Divine Master's eyes.

But further, what does he mean, by saying that the second precept of charity comes only *obiter*, that is "by the way," where it stands in Leviticus? For the context runs thus: "Thou shalt not calumniate thy neighbour, nor oppress him by violence...thou shalt not speak evil of the deaf...thou shalt not do that which is unjust, nor judge unjustly...thou shalt not be a detractor nor a whisperer among the people. Thou shalt not stand against the blood of thy neighbour. I am the Lord. Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart, but reprove him openly, lest thou incur sin through him. Seek not revenge, nor be mindful of the injury of thy citizens. *Thou shalt love thy friend as thyself.* I am the Lord." (xix. 13-18.) Could words cohere more completely with their antecedents than those which are declared to be placed *obiter*, as if out of place? They comprise the motive and summary of all that has been commanded: act towards others as you would that they should act towards you.

He goes on. "Whether the whole Pentateuch, such as

we have it, was in the hands of the learned in the Law, at the time that Jesus lived among men, or rather different parts of it were separately issued, and were known to the Pharisees rather than to the whole people, I will not decide. *Jesus knew the book of Genesis* (!) for He mentions Lot's wife, and the destruction of the Sodomites. He alludes casually to Lamech's song (Mat. xviii. 22.); and, according to Mark, He expressly quoted Exodus as a book of Moses...But if He knew the other books and thought they were to be overlooked (*negligendos duxit*) we conclude by an argument *a fortiori*, that Jesus recognized the law of Moses, which claims a divine origin to exist, not in those books, but in Deuteronomy." (p. 164.)

This reasoning is certainly startling. Besides the three texts alleged in the temptation, not applicable to the case under consideration, that is, Christ's appeal to the Law in His public teaching, we find, from Dr. Donaldson's own analysis the following results.

Our Lord quotes Deuteronomy *once*.

He cites Leviticus in conjunction, and without distinction.

He quotes Exodus as a book of Moses.

He refers to Genesis *twice* as relating *true* facts, illustrating his own mission from them.

[We may add that He refers to Numbers, when speaking of the brazen serpent. (Jo. iii. 14.) Again He alludes to this book as "the law," in Mat. xii. 5; the reference being to Num. xxviii. 9.]

Therefore Christ rejected all the books of the Pentateuch, except Deuteronomy!

But we emphasised a phrase at the beginning of this long quotation, because too important to be overlooked. It stated that Our Saviour, in appealing to the Law of Moses, referred to Deuteronomy as the sole authority. Now we ask, is it that defect of vision which system-building always causes, or is it a wilful shutting of his eyes to evidence that convicts his assertions of inaccuracy, that has made Dr. Donaldson overlook two passages, in which Christ refers to Deuteronomy, as to the law of Moses, but specifically for the purpose of correcting and abrogating it?

It is in Deuteronomy (xxiv. 1.) that the law of divorce is laid down: and to it Our Lord thus refers: "It hath been said, whosoever shall put away his wife let him give

her a bill of divorce; but I say to you, whosoever shall put away his wife," &c. (Mat. v. 31.) Yet there is a further remarkable lesson to our purpose, in this correction. Our Saviour actually amends the law of Deuteronomy from Genesis, and what is still more singular, from a portion of it which Dr. Donaldson has studiously rejected. For, in giving us the first chapters of that book, as he conceives they entered into Jashar, that is in their primitive, uncorrupted state, he omits, certainly not by accident, the account of the creation of Eve.* (p. 39.) Yet our Lord refers to this very passage, and on it bases the abrogation of the Mosaic law in Deuteronomy, and the establishment of the New Law of marriage. "Have ye not read that He who made man from the beginning made them male and female? And He said: 'for this cause shall a man leave father and mother,' &c. (Gen. ii. 24.)...What God hath joined let no man put asunder...Moses, by reason of the hardness of your heart permitted you to put away your wives. But in the beginning it was not so." (Mat. xix. 4-8.)

After these specimens of Dr. Donaldson's treatment of the Pentateuch, we will not weary our reader with the many other passages in which the blunders, interpolations, and critical errors of its parts are alluded to; but hasten on to the fifth part of Jashar. It contains the prophecies of Jacob, (Gen. xlix.) of Balaam, (Num. xxiii. seq.) and the Canticle of Moses. (Deut. xxxii.) Of the first, our author says: "on the age and author of this Canticle there have been many opinions. Some people are even as yet found, who believe that Jacob himself sung these words.....But even if you suppose Jacob to have been some man, and not, as I have before shown, the name of the Jasharan nation, and that he had twelve sons, &c., how can any one in his senses believe that a decrepit old man" could have written such a poem? "One is sorry

* So he excludes the description of the rivers of Paradise, as a blunder of "the old geographer" who wrote it; for "that Masoretic scribe, when he had to treat of the origin of the human race, not only collected the most ancient and most true traditions of history, but according to his wont, mixed them up with the religious poetry of the book of Jashar." (p. 73.) How are the two assertions to be reconciled?

and ashamed to confute such a childish interpretation in the middle of the nineteenth century after Christ." (p. 192.) It was written by a poet of Solomon's time, after the event. (p. 194.) There was no order of Levites in Solomon's time, or of priests properly so called. This class attained great power later, after Athalia's death, but it was only developed under Esdras, on the return from captivity. The canticle of Jacob was written before these times. (pp. 188, 228.) The *Shiloh* is struck out altogether, the name being merely an abbreviation of Solomon.

Balaam's prophecy is "simply poetical and forged," (confictam.) It was clearly written under Solomon. (p. 208 seqq.) The history of Balaam did not exist when the poem was composed. (p. 216.) The star and sceptre that had to rise in Israel relate to David. (p. 217.) However as all is written in the future tense, and clearly intended to pass off as a prophecy, we can call it nothing better than a forgery, if Dr. Donaldson is right.

The same judgment is passed upon the Canticle of Moses; all critics are agreed, he tells us, that the name prefixed to it is false. (p. 219.)

Before closing this fifth part, let us bring before our reader's mind one more text of the New Testament. Our Lord says to the Jews: "There is one that accuseth you, Moses, in whom ye trust. For if you did believe Moses, you would perhaps believe me also; for he wrote of me. But if you do not believe his writings, how will you believe me?" (Jo. v. 45.) This surely supposes the Jews to have been in possession of "writings" by Moses: and these writings spoke of Jesus; consequently were prophetic.

According to Dr. Donaldson, at the time of Solomon, and even to Ezechias, no writings of Moses existed except the book of Jashar, and perhaps some parts of Deuteronomy, then contained in it.* How very small this book

* "The quotations of Micheas and others which I have mentioned above, show that many other parts of Deuteronomy had a place in the book of Jashar; but the last edition of Deut. which has come down to us, has so introduced the patches of coarse cloth into the old garment, that it is difficult to separate the original from the insertions, without some fear of tearing. Let these three fragments therefore be as specimens, to which the learned reader may add as much as he pleases of Deuteronomy" (P. 179.). And what shall the ignorant reader do, who is simply told to read his bible?

was appears from Dr. Donaldson's work. Its Hebrew text occupies thirty-seven pages. Did our Saviour, in speaking of the writings of Moses, mean only the scanty compilation of documents in Solomon's time, or did He include the later forgeries or crude collections of Levitical scribes after the captivity? In decency, our learned divine will not make Him refer the Jews to these, as the best evidence in His favour, nor as being "Moses accusing them." This would hardly have been even just. Well then the book of Jashar at least contains the Moses's writings, and the prophecies of Christ, alluded to. But where? The very canticle that bears the Jewish lawgiver's name is spurious, and an afterthought of Solomon's time. Neither it, nor Jacob's testament, nor Balaam's songs are prophecies, nor Moses's writing or recording. And as to the prophecies, even those that were supposed to exist in these compositions, our modern commentator has struck out every one of them! What then did our Blessed Lord mean by these words? Where was their argument?

Should Dr. Donaldson say, that He appealed, by an *argumentum ad hominem*, to what the Jews thought were the books of Moses, we reply first, that he has already deprived himself of this argument, by expressing doubts whether in the time of Christ any besides the Pharisees knew or possessed the Pentateuch; and secondly that it is almost blasphemous to attribute to our Lord an appeal to evidence which he knew to be spurious, in that serious manner. "If you do not believe his writings, how will you believe Me!" This is equivalent to saying that the writings of Moses had evidences as strong as those which He put forward for Himself. It is thus that the tampering with the Old Testament saps the very foundations of the New.

The sixth section of Jashar, the last which we shall comment upon, is composed of three fragments—the triumphal Canticle of Moses and his sister (Exod. xv.); the song of Josue, made out of a variety of pieces from the Psalms, Kings, Exodus and Josue, and the Canticle of Debora. Suffice it to say that the first is attributed to the time of David or Solomon. (p. 245.) The second contains an old fragment, but the account of the sun standing still belongs to the compiler of the book, who lived after the captivity (p. 257,) for "the Masoretic scribe, having a taste for portents, took the old words into his stolid gloss" (our presen

text of the book) “differently from what they were written.” (p. 250.) As to a miracle there was no such thing; nor can a better illustration be given of what Josue said or did, than what “our general Wellington” exclaimed on Waterloo: “I wish that night or Blucher would come to our assistance!” (p. 249.)

Debora’s Song is a favourite, because the subject of an Essay read in Cambridge, in October 1848. This is admitted to be an ancient composition. The commentary on it does not offer us any particular ground of remark; but we cannot refrain from quoting the Cantabrigian’s estimate of the sister university. He tells us that “those Oxonian sophists violate four times a year ever so many and so great precepts of christianity.” (p. 263.)

We have promised to end here. The seventh part indeed consists of Psalms and Canticles thrown together, without any such reason as would have prevented many others from entering into the collection. We have only to remark that Anna’s song (1 Reg. or Sam. ii.) is converted into David’s canticle on the conquest of Goliath, “in the history of which many fabulous things are mixed up.” (p. 309.) And the reader will perhaps pardon us two more short quotations.

The first is: “with the following verses” (of Anna’s canticle) “everybody will compare the song of B. Mary in Luke the Evangelist. *Whence this song was derived I know not*; but whoever wrote it followed the Masoretic text, and attributed our hymn to Anna.” (p. 310.) This will speak for itself—the *Magnificat* is not genuine!

The second is what follows. The 57th Psalm thus describes David’s affliction when hiding in a cavern from Saul: “My life is spent among *lions*, I lie among *flaming fires*.” The captive Jews probably used these words often to console themselves. “But a scribe of a later age, thinking it right to invent any history of the dangers and deliverances of the Jewish princes under Nebuchodonosor, and Darius, expanded these metaphors of David’s, which all the exiles applied to themselves, into portentous narratives, and when relating the false accusations of the Babylonians, took care to make Daniel be let down into a lion’s den, and the three children cast into a burning furnace.” (p. 306.) Such is the origin of Scripture histories.

After the instances which we have given of Dr. Donaldson’s occasional dealing with the New Testament, we

deem it unnecessary to collect other passages, which may show how its authority is shaken by his treatment of the Old. The two indeed are so interwoven, that you cannot separate them. Every weakening of the authority of one is a blow to that of the other. In fact he informs us, that St. Mark's Gospel is mutilated in the end, that there are changes by later hands in the Acts, and in St. John, that St. Luke's gospel is a farrago (we suppose he means no disrespect by the word, though even in Latin it is not a becoming one in such a case.) borrowed from different witnesses, and that St. Matthew has a habit of putting in two people as acting, where the other Evangelists have one. "If this had happened once or twice, one would have been inclined to say that the Evangelist had forgotten, or otherwise erred." He accounts for this peculiarity by a supposed mistake of similar Aramaic letters by the transcriber. (pp. 14-16.)

But what carries the poison of infidelity from the Old to the New Testament, is the doctrine of inspiration as held by the writer. What belief in inspiration can he have, who considers great part of the Bible, except Jashar, to have been a recent compilation of priests pretending to write in the name of Moses, or other ancient authors, and who even believes the book of Jashar itself to have been a collection of poetical effusions that pretended to be prophecies? Accordingly he is very shadowy in his assertion of the inspiration of Scripture, which he tells us is to be understood to be God's word "not in a carnal or mechanical way, but because, respect being had to the arguments of the books, it contains, by a certain harmony, enclosed in itself, a signification of the Divine will; because it infolds and involves a revelation consigned *potentialiter*, as the scholastics say, by God Himself." (p. 2.) Then comes a note beginning as follows: "The Anglican Church does not use the word 'inspiration' otherwise than to signify that illumination, with which the Holy Spirit directs or animates (*informat*) the minds of individual Christians."

If this be true, judge ye, who are rulers or teachers in that law. It is not for us to pronounce on such a matter. We enter into the category of those "fautors of ecclesiastical traditions, who choose some contemptible doctors (*doctores nescio quos*) from the primitive age of christianity, who alone, they cry out, are to be followed, when babbling some old wive's fables or other." (p. 32.) Dr. Donaldson

on the other hand exclaims: "I say, and I repeat, that no other method is to be followed in handling the sacred books, than that whereby the interpretation of profane writers has made such progress." (p. 347.) There is a wide gulf between us; but Dr. D. assures us that on *his* side stands the English Establishment. "As to theology," he writes, "it ought to be sufficient to me, who am an Anglican priest and doctor, that no opinion or sentiment in this book helps in any way to impugn our Articles, that have never overstepped the lawful liberty of interpreting granted by the Bishop, confirmed by the university." (p. 347.)

We have a right to suppose that this is so; and that all his opinions can be harboured safely in the wide, if not deep, anchorage, of the established religion. The book has been long before the world, and no authoritative hand has raised a finger against it. The *Morning Herald*, not the most tuneful of theological organs, which the other day put forth a trumpery forgery as a document issuing from the Archbishop of Paris, attacked Dr. Donaldson sharply, and received the following reply.

"Bury St. Edmund's, May, 16, 1855.

"SIR,—My attention has been directed to a leading article in your paper of this morning, in which you call upon the bishops to do something—I cannot guess what—in regard to a critical treatise on the Old Testament written by me in Latin and published at Berlin last December. I make no comment on the propriety or impropriety of alluding to such matters in a daily newspaper, nor do I wish to ask how far it is consistent with your avowed opinions, as a champion of Protestantism, to invoke the aid of ecclesiastical authority in putting down that liberty of interpretation which it is once the privilege and the duty of every English clergyman to uphold. But as you have boldly entered on these delicate subjects I think you ought to allow me to tell your readers, that I am prepared to maintain against all gainsayers—Popes and bishops not excepted—the great principle, that, in religion as well as politics, the only true Conservative is he who does not peril his cause by making it responsible for particulars which are not only immaterial, but indefensible. The assumption which you put forward that Christianity must stand or fall with the literal infallibility of the Bible is the main cause of infidelity in these latter days. It has been my object, on the contrary, to show that all that is essential to revealed religion—nay, more—all the positive doctrines of my own Church—may be maintained without an adherence to those groundless prepossessions which every real scholar in England has

long ago renounced and abandoned as untenable. And what I have written in Latin and published in Germany, I shall defend in my own language, and justify to my own countrymen, whenever the proper time shall arrive.

“ I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

“ J. W. DONALDSON.”

This puts the matter fairly to issue. The writer will answer for all his opinions to his own countrymen, when the proper time arrives. This, we presume, would be, when those ecclesiastical superiors to whom appeal has been made, shall summon him to do so. If these do not call him to account, he has a right, after this challenge, to conclude that all his opinions are within the limits of those tolerated, or rather protected—for this silence shields them—within the national religion. If he can conclude this, we have a right to do the same.

ART. VIII.—*A Memoir of the Reverend Sidney Smith*, by his Daughter, LADY HOLLAND. With a selection from his Letters, edited by [Mrs. Austin. 2 vols. London : Longman, 1855.

AS Sidney Smith, who was then a dignitary of the Established Church, was writing one morning at his favourite bay-window, in his comfortable parsonage at Combe Florey, in Somersetshire, a pompous little man in rusty black was ushered into the apartment. “ May I ask,” says the Canon of St. Paul’s, “ what procures me the honour of this visit !” “ Oh,” said the little man, “ I am compounding a history of the distinguished families in Somersetshire, and have called to obtain the Smith’s arms.” “ I regret, sir,” he replied, “ not to be able to contribute to so valuable a work, but the Smiths never had any arms, and have invariably sealed their letters with their thumbs.” He loved to repeat the answer of Junot to the old noblesse when boasting of their ancestors : “ Ah, ma foi ! je n’en sais rien ; mais je suis mon ancetre.” Writ-

ing to Mrs. Meynell, Feb. 25th, 1831, he uses this lively comparison to express his horror even of those wars and revolutions which are undertaken for the advancement of civilization. "Wild beasts must be killed in the progress of civilization, but thank God that my ancestors,—that is not mine, for I had none, but Mr. Meynell's ancestors,—did this some centuries ago." And in 1826, writing to his wife from Paris, he says: "I have bought a coat of arms on a seal for six shillings, which will hereafter be the coat of arms of the family; this letter is sealed with it." On his carriage—when he got one—he put the motto, *Faber meæ fortunæ*, by which he declared to all the world that he owed nothing for lineage, and that he was the architect of his own fortune.

Yet Sidney Smith could not say with poor Burns, that his

"Ignoble blood
Had flowed through scoundrels ever since the flood,"

for he was the son of a gentleman of moderate fortune. His father, Mr. Robert Smith, was very clever, but odd by nature, and still more odd by design. He married at an early age a Miss Olier, the younger daughter of a French emigrant, whose family was dependent for support on a school for young ladies, which was kept by his elder daughter in Bloomsbury Square. At the church door Mr. Smith gave his beautiful bride in charge to her mother, and immediately set off to America. After wandering over the world for many years he returned, recovered his wife, and spent the remainder of a long life in diminishing his fortune, by buying, altering, spoiling, and then selling about nineteen different places in England, till, in his old age, he at last settled at Bishop's Lydiard, in Somersetshire, where he died. He was the father of five children, no two of which, it is to be presumed, saw the light in the same county. In 1771 Robert Smith resided at Woodford, in Essex, and in that year his second son, Sidney, was born. The child inherited a little of his father's address, and all the sprightliness of his mother. Sidney once upon a time met a gentleman in a coach who told him of a very *odd* clever fellow called Sidney Smith, who then resided at Bristol. He instantly and very properly informed his companion that he was Sidney Smith, because, he says, my companions might have proceeded to

inform me that I had murdered my grandmother, and this I would have been obliged to have resented. Had he been less witty, many things which he did and wrote and said would have acquired for him the character of an odd fellow, but as it was, they became the accessories of his wit. No other man could have farmed by means of a speaking trumpet, or driven about the country with a sieve of corn attached to the point of the shaft of a vehicle, which had so often been renewed by village carpenters, tinkers, and tailors, that he called it the *immortal*—the object of the said sieve being to delude a lazy horse into the idea that if he were to trot he would overtake a feed of oats—without incurring the imminent risk of being shut up for life in a lunatic asylum. But what would have been insanity in another man, Sidney's comments made irresistibly ludicrous, at the same time that they effectually secured himself from being regarded as a buffoon. On the contrary, you learned to admire him by the light of his genius, which shone upon everything which he came in contact. Nil teligit quod non ornarit. He called this sluggish horse Calamity, and the sieve his patent Tantalus. He used to ride as well as drive Tantalus, and we must, as an illustration of what we have been saying, allow himself to tell how his equestrianism came to an end.

“ ‘I used,’ he says, ‘to consider a fall from a horse dangerous, but much experience has convinced me to the contrary. I have had six falls in two years, and just behaved like the three per cents when they fall. I got up again, and am not a bit the worse for it, any more than the stock in question.’ Nevertheless, he adds, ‘I left off riding, for the good of my parish and the peace of my family; for, somehow or other, my horse and I had a habit of parting company. On one occasion I found myself suddenly prostrate in the streets of York, much to the delight of the Dissenters. Another time my horse Calamity flung me over his head into a neighbouring parish, as if I had been a shuttlecock, and I felt grateful it was not into a neighbouring planet; but as no harm came of it, I might have persevered perhaps if, on a certain day a quaker tailor from a neighbouring village, to which I had said I was going to ride, had not taken it into his head to call soon after my departure, and request to see Mrs. Sidney. She instantly, conceiving I was thrown, if not killed, rushed down to the man exclaiming, ‘Where is he? where is your master? is he hurt? The astonished and quaking snip stood silent from surprise. Still more agitated by his silence, she exclaimed, ‘Is he hurt? I insist upon knowing the

worst.' 'Why, please ma'am, it is only thy little bill, a very small account, I wanted to settle,' replied he in much surprise."

After this he gave up riding, notwithstanding his conviction that he knew one man who was a worse rider than himself, and who was at least one fall ahead of him.

Sidney Smith, and his elder brother, Robert, inherited from their mother, along with other estimable things, a considerable portion of her beauty. Robert was very intimate with Tallyrand, when he was living as an emigrant in this country. On one occasion the conversation turned upon the beauty often transmitted by parents to their children. Young Smith spoke with enthusiasm of his mother's beauty, on which Tallyrand exclaimed with a shrug, "Ah! mon ami, c'était donc apparemment monsieur votre père qui vetait pas bien."

Their mother describes the young Smiths as neglecting games, seizing every hour of leisure for study, and often lying on the floor stretched over their books, discussing with loud voice and most vehement gesticulation, every point that arose, often subjects above their years, and arguing upon them with a warmth and fierceness as if life and death hung upon the issue. At the age of six Sidney was sent to school to Southampton, and from thence with his youngest brother, Courtenay, to the Foundation at Winchester. There they suffered "many years of misery and positive starvation; there never was enough provided, even of the coarsest food, for the whole school, and the little boys were of course left to fare as they could." Even in his old age he used to shudder at the recollection of Winchester, nor could he ever speak but with horror of the whole system, which was one of abuse, neglect, and vice. But in spite of hunger and neglect, he rose to be captain of the school, and the two brothers received a flattering, though involuntary, compliment from their schoolfellows, who signed a round-robin and sent it to Dr. Warton, the Warden, "refusing to try for the college prizes if the Smiths were allowed to contend for them any more, as they always gained them." He used to say, "I believe, whilst a boy at school, I made above ten thousand Latin verses, and no man in his senses would dream in after life of ever making another." But although he did not make any more verses he preserved his knowledge of the language by reading some Latin

book, and translating English into Latin every day of his life. From this picture of Winchester School it would seem that the original of Dotheboys Hall might have been found in other parts of England as well as in Yorkshire.

As Captain of Winchester Sidney Smith became entitled to a Scholarship and afterwards to a Fellowship in New College, Oxford. Before going there his father sent him to Mount Villiers, in Normandy, where he remained *en pension* for six months, to perfect his knowledge of French, which he spoke ever afterwards with great fluency, although he did not write it correctly. As the fierceness of the French Revolution was then at its height, he thought it necessary to enroll himself in one of the Jacobin clubs of the town, in which he was entered as "Le Citoyen Smit, Membre Affilié au Club des Jacobins de Mont Villiers." And, in fact, had it not been for his address and citizenship he would have been hung on a lantern-post along with his brother and Captain Drinkwater, who in spite of his remonstrances had drawn the gendarme upon them, by commencing to sketch the works at Cherbourg.

New College, which he entered on his return from France, was renowned for nothing but the quantity of port wine consumed by the Fellows. Sidney obtained his fellowship as soon as possible, but as this was worth only £100. per annum, and as his father never afterwards gave him a penny until his death, he had to choose between a gaol and abstinence from port wine. Sidney choose the latter alternative, and to his abstinence he owed perhaps his health and moral conduct, as well as his liberty. Indeed, with his slender income, he not only kept clear of debts himself, but even paid £30. which his brother Courtenay owed at Winchester. Had Sidney, with his fascinating powers, become a member of a drinking club in College, there can be little doubt but that he would have been ruined.

On leaving college it became necessary to choose a profession. His own inclination was strongly in favour of the Bar, but his father urged him so earnestly to enter the Church, that he felt it his duty to obey, and he became a curate in a small village in the midst of Salisbury Plain. He describes himself as the first pauper in the hamlet, which consisted of a few scattered cottages and farms. Once a week a butcher's cart came over from Salisbury

on which occasions only could he obtain any flesh meat, and he often dined on a mess of potatoes, sprinkled with a little catsup. He was too poor to buy books, or to keep a horse, and his only resource was to discuss the breed of his dogs with the squire, or to cross over those interminable plains by that aboriginal species of *tandem*, which consists in constantly placing one leg before the other. In such circumstances we would not pity a Catholic priest, because he ought to have abundant occupation in his constant communication with the spiritual world, in his association with the Saviour Himself, and through Him with all that is holiest and highest in heaven. He had been trained year after year to shut out the world entirely at appointed seasons, and for weeks to converse with no one but his God. Who has experienced this great blessing without feeling sad and wearied, by being obliged again to descend to the heartless intercourse of the world, and the frivolous society of men? But poor Sidney knew nothing of all this, because he had never been taught it; and it is a most grievous mistake to imagine that the most sublime of all sciences—the only one really worth possessing—the science of serving God, and of living with Him, requires no instruction. This grievous and pernicious error is assumed as a first principle in all Protestant universities. Sidney Smith was not only endowed with genius,—his mind was not only stored with knowledge, and his intellect enlightened by science, but he was moreover, an upright and an honest man. His love of truth and of justice was paramount; for these he remained poor, and sacrificed his hopes—or rather the certainty—of preferment. In generosity, in goodness of heart, in benevolence, he had rarely a superior. But of the supernatural world he had no knowledge or conception whatever. He was a firm believer in the Gospel, and in the doctrines of his Church, but he read and interpreted it by the light of reason alone. He had a sincere and generous tone of morality, but with him moral rectitude meant nothing more than common sense. Of mortification, self-denial, abandonment of all things as utterly worthless, or worse, in order to give the whole heart to God, and of all the thousand higher and holier aspirations of the spiritualized christian he knew nothing. He confounded them all with the cant of the Methodist, or the fanaticism of the Irvingite, and he consequently despised them. “It must,” says

Mrs. Austin, "be constantly borne in mind, that Mr. Sidney Smith did not regard Christianity as an *ascetic* religion, but as a religion of peace, and joy, and *comfort*."* The comfort is here opposed to asceticism, and is therefore applied, not to spiritual, but to corporal ease.

What a place must Salisbury Plain have been, for a man endowed with extraordinary wit and genius, with those bewitching arts which fitted him to adorn the highest and most exquisite society, and who, moreover, believed that he had been placed in this world, not only to be just and benevolent, and tolerant, but moreover to eat good dinners, to enjoy good company, and to be as joyous as possible,—to be condemned to live amongst the ignorant boors of Salisbury Plain! "When first," he says, "I went into the church, I had a curacy in the midst of Salisbury Plain; the parish was Netherhaven, near Amesbury. The Squire of the parish, Mr. Beact, took a fancy to me, and after I had served it two years, he engaged me as tutor to his eldest son, and it was arranged that I and his son should proceed to the University of Weimar, in Saxony. We set out, but before reaching our destination, Germany was disturbed by war, and, in stress of politics, we put into Edinburgh, where I remained five years." It was in the year 1797 that Mr. Smith arrived in Edinburgh, and he quickly formed acquaintance with Jeffrey, Horner, Playfair, Walter Scott, Dugald Stewart, Brougham, Brown, Allison, and many other distinguished men, who at that time resided in the Scottish capital.

Though the style of no two men who wrote the same language could be more dissimilar than that of Sidney Smith and of Samuel Johnson, yet there are many points of great similarity between them. They were both fat men, both abstemious in the use of wine,—both endowed with powers of reasoning and of witty repartee far beyond any of their contemporaries. It is also not a little singular that the most intimate friends of each of them were Scotchmen, and that each of them had an irresistible propensity to ridicule the foibles and peculiarities of the Scottish people.

" 'It requires,' Sydney used to say, 'a surgical operation to get a joke well into a Scotch understanding. Their only idea of wit, on

* Preface, vol. ii. p. 12.

rather that inferior variety of this electric talent which prevails occasionally in the North, and which, under the name of WUT, is so infinitely distressing to people of good taste, is laughing immoderately at stated intervals. They are so imbued with metaphysics that they even make love metaphysically; I overheard a young lady of my acquaintance, at a dance in Edinburgh, exclaim in a sudden pause of the music, 'What you say, my Lord, is very true of love in the *abstract*, but—' here the fiddlers began fiddling furiously, and the rest was lost. You find they usually arrange their dishes at dinner by the points of the compass; 'Sandy, put that gigot of mutton, to the south, and move the singet sheep's head a wee bit to the nor-wast.' If you knock at the door, you hear a shrill female from the fifth flat shriek out, 'Wha's chapping at the door?' which is presently opened by a lassie with short petticoats, bare legs and thick ankles. My Scotch servants bargained they were not to have salmon more than three times a week, and always pulled off their stockings in spite of my repeated objurgations, the moment my back was turned. Their temper stands anything but an attack on their climate; even the enlightened mind of Jeffrey cannot shake off the illusion that myrtles flourish at Craig Crook. In vain I have represented to him that they are of the genus *carduus*, and pointed out their prickly peculiarities. In vain I have reminded him that I have seen hackney-coaches drawn by four horses in the winter, on account of the snow; that I have rescued a man blown flat against my door by the violence of the winds, and black in the face, that even the experienced Scotch fowls did not venture to cross the streets, but sidled along, tails aloft, without venturing to encounter the gale. Jeffrey sticks to his myrtle illusions, and treats my attacks with as much contempt as if I had been a wild visionary, who had never breathed his cellar air, nor lived and suffered under the rigour of his climate, nor spent five years in discussing metaphysics and medicine in that garret of the earth.—that knuckle-end of England—that land of Calvin, oat-cakes, and sulphur.' 'Never,' he exclaims, 'shall I forget the happy days passed in Scotland, amidst odious smells, barbarous sounds, bad suppers, excellent hearts, and most enlightened and cultivated understandings.'

"Why," he asks Jeffrey, "so modest as to stand for a place in Scotland? Who humbled you into a notion that you were sufficiently destitute of probity, originality and talents, to enjoy a chance of success?" He tells Jeffrey himself "if you could be alarmed into the semblance of modesty, you would charm everybody; but remember my joke against you;—'D——n the solar system! had light—planets too distant—pestered with comets—feeble contrivance;—could make a better with great ease.'"

Again he inquires whether there is a man in

Edinburgh in whose house a young Englishman could be safely deposited, without peril of marrying a Scotch girl with a fortune of 1s. 6d. sterling. To Lady Holland* he sends two-brace of grouse—"curious because killed by a Scotch metaphysician; in other and better language, they are mere ideas, shot by other ideas, out of a pure intellectual notion, called a gun. "I found," he adds, "a great number of philosophers in Edinburgh in a high state of obscurity and metaphysics...Horner is so extremely serious about the human race, that I am forced to compose my face half a street off before I meet him." "When you talk," he says to Jeffrey, "of the clamours of Edinburgh, I will not remind you of a tempest in a pot, for that would be to do injustice to the metropolis of the North; but a hurricane in a horse-pond is a simile useful for conveying my meaning, and not unjust to the venerable city of Edinburgh." To Lady Holland he writes, "I hear you have got a good tutor for Henry which I am exceedingly glad of...You are aware that it is necessary to fumigate Scotch tutors: they are excellent men, but require this little preliminary caution...I hope you have read, or are reading, Mr. Stewart's book, and are far gone in the philosophy of mind, a science as he repeatedly tells us, still in its infancy; I propose, myself, to wait till it comes to years of discretion..Lord Holland is quite right to get a stock of eatable sheep; but such sheep are not exclusively the product of Scotland, but of every half-starved, ill-cultivated country; and are only emphatically called Scotch, to signify ill-fed; as one says Roman to signify brave." He tells Jeffrey that "the most delicate and sensitive turpitude is always to be met with in Scotland," and that "he (Jeffrey) over-praises all Scotch books and writers." On hearing that the people of Scotland were about to erect statues to two native professors, he wrote to his friend: "People in England have a very bad habit of laughing at Scotch economy; and the supposition was that the statue was to be Januform, with

* The Lady Holland mentioned in the text is not Sidney Smith's daughter—the wife of Sir Henry Holland—but the lady of the late Lord Holland, and the mistress of Holland House, where Mr. Smith spent many of his happiest, and found some of his earliest and fastest friends.

Playfair's face on one side, and Stewart's on the other; and it certainly would effect a reduction in price, though it would be somewhat singular." Having been informed that the affair about the statues was a joke, he says: "I am glad to hear that the intention of raising a statue to Playfair and Stewart is now reported to have been only a joke. This is *wut*, not wit; by way of pleasantry, the oddest conceit I have heard of; but you gentlemen from the North are, you know, a little singular in your conceptions of the *sipid*." "The Commissioner," he writes to Earl Grey, "will have hard work with the Scotch Atheists; they are said to be numerous this season, and in great force from the irregular supply of rain." "When I lived in Scotland," he tells Lady Mary Bennett, "very few maids had shoes and stockings, but plodded about the house with feet as big as a family Bible, and legs as large as portmanteaus." "The curses of Glasgow," he informs Sir George Philips, "are itch, punch, cotton and metaphysics." "It is in vain," he says, "that I study the subject of the Scotch Church. I have heard it ten times over from Murray and twenty times from Jeffrey, and I have not the smallest conception what it is about. I know it has something to do with oatmeal, but beyond that I am in utter darkness." When the queen first visited the land of Cakes; he writes to one of his Scotch friends to know if she showed any turn for metaphysics. "The Scotch newspapers," he says, "pretend that even the weather was fine, but on the subject of the weather no Scotchman is to be believed, even on his oath...Remember me very kindly to the maximus minimus (Jeffrey) and to the Scotch Church. I have urged my friend, the Bishop of Durham, to prepare kettles of soup for the seceders, who will probably be wandering in troops over our northern counties."

We dare not venture to extract any more of the "winged arrows," with which he tickled the land of oat-cake and Calvinism, but there can be no doubt that in this, as in other matters, he made his wit the medium by which he conveyed his genuine sentiments; for never was there a man who could have more truly taken for his motto: "Quid netat ridentem dicere verum." But his distrust of the Scotch generally, made him admire and love more profoundly those honourable men, who amidst narrow-minded bigotry and general corruption, had imbibed

liberal and just principles, and honestly followed them, though for so doing they had the agreeable prospect of being obliged to spend their lives on a thirteenth story, from which if they descended, their small allowance of oatmeal would scarcely give them strength enough to get back again. "Jeffrey," he tells Lady Holland, Nov. 6th, 1827, "has been here with his adjectives, who always travel with him. His throat is giving way; so much wine goes down it, so many million words leap over it, how can it rest? Pray make him a judge; he is a truly great man, and is very heedless of his own interests. I lectured him on his romantic folly of wishing his friends to be preferred before himself, and succeeded, I think, in making him a little more selfish." "How," he inquires of Mr. (afterwards Lord) Murray, "is Jeffrey's throat?"

"That throat so vexed by cackle and by cup,
Where wine descends and endless words come up;
Much injured organ! constant is thy toil,
Spits turn to do thee harm and coppers boil:
Passion and punch and toasted cheese and paste,
And all that's said and swallowed lay thee waste!"

Again he writes to the Countess Grey (Sept. 6th, 1829): "The only visitor I have here is Mr. Jeffrey, who, I believe (though he richly deserves that good fortune) is scarcely known to Lord Grey and yourself. A man of rare talent and unbending integrity, who has been honest even in Scotland; which is as if he were temperate and active at Capua." "I cannot say," he tells Murray (Dec. 14th, 1829), "the pleasure it gives me that my old and dear friend Jeffrey is in the road to preferment. I shall not be easy till he is fairly on the Bench. His robes, God knows, will cost him little; one buck rabbit will clothe him to the heels."

It is wonderful what fertility of imagination he displays even on this one small subject—Jeffrey's diminutive stature. And yet he never repeats a stale joke; what he says is always new and amusing. When Jeffrey tells him that he has sent his portrait in a small parcel which a gentleman has kindly taken in his pocket, Sidney imagines that it must be as large as life; and when he invites Jeffrey to pay him a visit he asks, "When are we to see you (a thing always difficult to do)." "Pray tell me," he writes to Mr. Murray in 1830, "how you are all going on

Scotland. Is Jeffrey much damaged? They say he fought like a lion, and would have been killed had he been more visible; but that several people struck at him who could see nothing, and so battered infinite space instead of the Advocate." "Magnitude, to you my dear Jeffrey," he tells his friend, "must be such an intoxicating idea, that I have no doubt you would rather be gigantic in your errors, than immense in no respect whatever; however, comfort yourself that your good qualities are far beyond the common size." Sidney loved and admired his little friend with his whole heart, and he richly deserved both. One time he arrived at Mr. Smith's house in Yorkshire, where he found no person but the children, who were leading a young donkey round the garden with a pocket-handkerchief for a bridle. With his usual love for the society of children, Jeffrey joined in the sport, and to their infinite delight mounted the donkey. He was proceeding in triumph," says Lady Holland, "amidst our shouts of laughter, when my father and mother, in company, I believe, with Mr. Horner and Mr. Murray, returned from their walk and beheld this scene from the garden door. Though years and years have passed away since, I still remember the joy-inspiring laughter that burst from my mother at this unexpected sight, as, advancing towards his old friend, with a face beaming with delight and with extended hands, he broke forth in the following impromptu:—

"Witty as Horatius Flaccus,
As great a Jacobin as Gracchus;
Short, though not as fat as Bacchus,
Riding on a little Jackass!"—Vol. i. p. 153.

Regarding diminutiveness of stature he had even jokes to row away on Lord John Russell. During the height of the Reform agitation, such of the people as saw Lord John, expressed great dissatisfaction on discovering that their champion was such a pigmy. But Sidney quickly conciled them to him, and even brought tears into their eyes, by declaring that he had been twice as big, but that he had lost half his magnitude in consequence of the rejection of the Reform Bill by the House of Lords. He writes to Lady Holland, October 15th, 1830, Lord John Russell comes here to-day. His corporeal antipart, Lord

N—, is here. Heaven send he may not swallow John. There are, however, stomach-pumps in case of accident.”

Every man has a standard of his own for measuring his neighbour. Some measure him by his moral or intellectual qualities, some by the cut of his coat, some by his capacity for the consumption of solids or liquids, some by the length of his nose, and some, of whom Sidney Smith formed one, by his corporeal magnitude. Thus, on being appointed Canon of Bristol, in 1828, he describes some of his clerical confreres to the same lady as follows: “The little dean I have not seen; he is as small as the bishop, they say. It is supposed that one of these ecclesiastics, elevated upon the shoulders of the other, would fall short of the Archbishop of Canterbury’s wig. The Archbishop of York is forced to go down on his knees to converse with the Bishop of Bristol, just as an elephant kneels to receive its rider.” “Jeffrey’s legs,” he writes to Lord Murray, “have as little to support as any legs in the island; I cannot see why they should be out of order.”

One principle Sidney Smith rigidly adhered to, which is as rare as it is commendable in a professed wit. He never hurt any man’s feelings for the sake of a joke. “One speech,” he says, “I remember of Lord Dudley’s gratified me much. When I took leave of him, on quitting London to go into Yorkshire, he said to me, ‘You have been laughing at me constantly, Sidney, for the last seven years, and yet in all that time you never said a single thing to me that I wished unsaid.’” (vol. i. p. 365.) Lord Dudley must indeed have been a tempting subject for Sidney’s mirth. One day the lord met the parson in the street, and said, “dine with me to-day, and I will get Sidney Smith to meet you.” Sidney admitted the temptation, but said he was engaged to meet that gentleman elsewhere. On another occasion when they met, he put his arm through Sidney’s, muttering to himself at the same time, “I don’t mind walking with him a little way; I’ll walk with him as far as the end of the street.” As a gentleman of their acquaintance passed them, he was heard again to soliloquise; “That is the villain who helped me yesterday to asparagus, and gave me no toast.” He once nearly upset Sidney’s gravity in the pulpit, by crying out in the middle of the sermon, “hear, hear, hear,” being

under the impression for the moment that he was in the House of Commons.

Sidney possessed in his matchless powers of wit and of ridicule, strong and dangerous weapons, and it was his proud boast that he never employed them except to promote the liberty and happiness of his fellow men. In sending a lady a list of all his contributions to the "Edinburgh Review," he says, he defies her to show him one line in them all which is opposed to these great objects. As we have on a former occasion* extracted his account of the origin and early progress of the "Edinburgh Review," from the preface to his collected essays, we shall not now say anything on this subject. He edited the two first numbers, and continued to be one of its ablest contributors for more than twenty years, during all which time he advocated the principles of toleration and liberty, although he was fully persuaded that this line of conduct would keep both himself and his family in poverty. King George III., on reading some of his writings said, "He is a very clever fellow, but will never be a bishop." "Oh, Mr. Smith," said Lord Stowel to him, "you would have been in a different situation, and a far richer man, if you would have belonged to us." But Sidney never wavered in his course,—never swerved from the paths of truth and justice. "It pleases me," he writes to Jeffrey, April 2nd, 1819, "sometimes to think of the very great number of important subjects which have been discussed in so enlightened a manner in the 'Edinburgh Review.' It is a sort of magazine of liberal sentiments, which I hope will be read by the rising generation, and infuse into them a proper contempt for their parent's stupid and unphilosophical prejudices." And again in 1825: "It must be to you as it is to me, a real pleasure to see so many improvements taking place, and so many abuses destroyed,—abuses upon which you with cannon and mortars, and I with sparrow-shot, have been playing for so many years."

Nor was it only in the "Review" that he devoted himself to the cause of freedom and toleration. In 1807 he wrote the famous letters of Peter Plymley, in favour of the Catholics, which contributed in no small degree to prepare the minds of the English people for the great act

* Article on Lord Jeffrey's Life, Dublin Review, xxxii. 464 and foll.
VOL. XXXIX.—NO. LXXVII.

of 1829. Whilst he was rector of Foston, in Yorkshire, a meeting of the clergy of the East Riding was called, in the year 1825, to petition parliament against the emancipation of the Catholics. He attended the meeting, and though he had but one supporter he drew up a petition, and delivered a powerful speech in favour of emancipation.

His domestic virtues, his generosity, his kindness of heart, shine forth conspicuously in every page of his correspondence. Like all poor parsons, he of course married at an early age. This event occurred during his residence in the Scotch capital, but the lady was not a Scotch girl with a fortune of 1s. 6d., but an Englishwoman, called Pybus, who had some little fortune. Sidney's own fortune at this time consisted of six small silver teaspoons, which after his marriage he flung into his wife's lap, saying, "There, Kate, you lucky girl, I give you all my fortune." He insisted that every penny of his wife's fortune should be settled on herself, and it would not have been easy for the newly married pair to have commenced housekeeping, or perhaps even to have paid the coach hire to Edinburgh, had not Mrs. Pybus bestowed a necklace on her daughter which she sold for £500. At the end of their Edinburgh residence Mr. Beach presented Sidney with a thousand pounds for the care of his son which he invested in the funds, with the exception of £100, that he lent to a widow lady and her four daughters, whose pecuniary difficulties he had accidentally discovered. Even his daughters never heard of this act of generosity until after his death. There are few men with a family, and without any prospect of wealth, who are capable of such deeds. About the same time he subscribed £40. towards the outfit of a poor, but clever young man, who had obtained an appointment in India.

In 1803 he came to London, friendless and obnoxious to government. He preached occasionally to volunteer regiments, as they came into the city, but obtained no permanent employment for two years, at the expiration of which period he gladly accepted of the preachship of the Foundling Hospital, at £50. per annum. He was offered by the proprietor a chapel, then occupied by a sect of dissenters, calling themselves the New Jerusalem, provided he could obtain the necessary license from the rector of the parish, who professed to be his friend. He did not obtain

the license however, because the prudent rector was afraid that his own orthodox hearers, as well as the dissenters, might be attracted by the eloquent young preacher. But although he was not advancing in the Church, he was loved and respected in society, and was making many warm and sincere friends, amongst whom Lord and Lady Holland deserve to be specially mentioned. His preaching also at the Foundling Hospital gained him considerable reputation, for a Mr. Bowerbank induced him to preach in the morning in a deserted chapel of his, for which he could not get a purchaser. Sydney accepted the offer, and in a few weeks not a seat was to be had; of course the proprietor gave up all idea of selling, and the young and witty parson kept the chapel well filled, until he left London in 1809. His reputation was also greatly increased by a course of lectures which he delivered, on Moral Philosophy. The sensation created by these lectures was tremendous. "All Albemarle-street," says an eye-witness, "and part of Grafton-street, were rendered impassable by the concourse of carriages assembled there during the time of their delivery. There was not sufficient room for the persons assembling; the lobbies were filled, and the doors into them from the lecture-room were left open; the steps leading into its area were all occupied; many persons to obtain seats came an hour before the time. The next year galleries were erected, which had never before been required, and the success was complete. He continued to lecture there for three consecutive years." Horner says the success was beyond all possible conjecture, that a seat was not to be procured even an hour before the time, and that "nobody else could have executed such an undertaking with the least chance of success. For who could make such a mixture of odd paradox, quaint fun, manly sense, liberal opinions, and striking language?" Sir Robert Peel (we can no more speak of the *late* Sir R. Peel than of the late Napoleon Buonaparte,) says, "I was present at the lectures forty years ago, and was a very young man at the time; but I have not forgotten the effect which was given to the speech of Logan, the Indian Chief, by the tone and spirit in which it was recited."

These lectures have been published by Mrs. Smith since the death of the author; in spite of the remonstrances even of Jeffrey. She has moreover the merit of having saved them from the flames when Sidney himself had con-

demned them to destruction. In 1843, he wrote to Dr. Whewell; "My lectures are gone to the dogs and are utterly forgotten. I knew nothing of moral philosophy, but I was thoroughly aware that I wanted £200. to furnish my house. The success however was prodigious; all Albemarle street blocked up with carriages, and such an uproar, as I never remember to have been excited by any other literary imposture. Every week I had a new theory about conceptions and perceptions; and supported by a natural manner, a torrent of words, and an impudence scarcely credible in this prudent age. Still, in justice to myself, I must say there were some good things in them. But good and bad are all gone." He had indeed the rare modesty of undervaluing his own writings. In this instance, however, the partial opinion of affection has proved to be more correct than that of either the author or the critic; for the publication of the lectures has procured scarcely less posthumous fame for their author, than their delivery obtained for him whilst he was living. Only three days before he was seized with the fatal illness which caused his death, Jeffrey wrote his recantation to Mrs. Smith. "I am now satisfied," he says, "that in what I then said I did great and grievous injustice to the merit of these lectures, and was quite wrong in dissuading their publication, or concluding they would add nothing to the reputation of the author; on the contrary; my firm impression is, that, with few exceptions, they will do him as much credit as anything he ever wrote, and produce on the whole a stronger impression of the force and vivacity of his intellect, as well as a truer and more engaging view of his character, than most of what the world has yet seen of his writings." For these lectures, after the delivery of the first series, he was allowed to name his own terms, and we need scarcely say that the proceeds were very acceptable to him, for he was still a poor man and wanted his house well furnished. His favourite maxim was: Make home comfortable, avoid shame, but do not seek glory,—nothing so expensive as glory."


He gave a pleasant little supper party each week at which there was both fun and feasting. On one of these occasions Sir James Mackintosh brought with him a raw Scotch cousin, an ensign in a Highland regiment.

"On hearing the name of his host he suddenly turned round,

and, nudging Sir James said in an audible whisper, 'Is that the great Sir Sidney?' 'Yes, yes,' said Sir James, and giving his host the hint, he assumed the military character, performed the part of the hero of Acre to perfection, fought all his battles over again, and showed how he had charged the Turks, (?) to the infinite delight of the young Scotchman, who was quite enchanted with the kindness of the great Sir Sudney, as he called him, and to the absolute torture of the other guests who were bursting with laughter. At last after an evening of the most inimitable acting on the part of Sidney and Sir James, nothing would serve the young Highlander but setting off at twelve o'clock at night, to fetch the piper of his regiment to pipe to the great Sir Sudney, who said he never heard the bagpipes; upon which the whole party broke up, for Sir James said his Scotch cousin would infallibly cut his throat if he discovered his mistake."—Vol. i. pp. 89. 90.

In 1806 the Whigs got what might be called a glimpse of power, and through the exertions of his friends at Holland House, Sidney was appointed by the Lord Chancellor Erskine, to the living of Foston-le-Clay in Yorkshire, to which place in consequence of the bill requiring residence, he was obliged to remove in 1809, and what was worse, he was forced to build a parsonage which cost him £4000. Up to this time there had not been a resident minister in the parish for a century and a half. It was here he drove by means of a sieve and farmed by trumpet, and did everything in a new and extraordinary manner. His parishioners were so unaccustomed to the sights of civilised life, that they were astonished to behold a gentleman from London in a superfine coat and a four-wheeled carriage. On his first arrival he held a long conversation with the clerk of the parish, who at length striking his stick on the ground, said, "Muster Smith, it often strikes moy moind, that people as comes frae London is such *fools*, but you, I see, are no fool."

He had now a tolerably large family about him, and sufficient, though not abundant, means of support, for during one dear season they were obliged to subsist on their own damaged wheat, and his daughter speaks feelingly of the comfort she felt in returning to baker's bread. But still it was probably here he practically experienced, that "happiness is oftener found among little children and home firesides, and in country houses than anywhere else." He could even turn a mishap into a source of enjoyment, not



only for the moment, but for many a year afterwards. It is thus he describes the failure of a country dinner:—

“ Did you ever dine out in the country? What misery human beings inflict on each other under the name of pleasure! We went to dine yesterday with Mr. ———, a neighbouring clergyman, a haunch of venison being the stimulus to the invitation. We set out at five o'clock, drove in a boiling sun on dusty roads three miles in our best gowns, found squire and parsons assembled in a small hot room, the whole house redolent of frying; talked, as is our want, of roads, weather, and turnips; that done, began to grow hungry, then serious, then impatient. At last a stripling, evidently caught up for the occasion, opened the door and beckoned our host out of the room. After some moments of awful suspense, he returned to us with a face of much distress, saying, the woman assistant in the kitchen had mistaken the soup for dirty water, and had thrown it away, so we must do without it; we all agreed it was perhaps as well we should, under the circumstances. At last to our joy, dinner was announced; but oh, ye gods! as we entered the diningroom what a gale met our nose! the venison was high, the venison was uneatable, and was obliged to follow the soup with all speed. Dinner proceeded, but our spirits flagged under these accumulated misfortunes: there was an ominous pause between the first and second course; we looked each other in the face—what new disaster awaited us? the pause became fearful. At last the door burst open, and the boy rushed in, calling out aloud, ‘ Please, Sir, has Betty any right to leather!’ What human gravity could stand this? we roared with laughter; all took part against Betty, obtained the second course with much difficulty, bored each other the usual time, ordered our carriages, expecting our post boys to be drunk, and were grateful to Providence for not permitting them to deposit us in a wet ditch. So much for dinners in the country!”


The memory of one such dinner is worth more than all the Lord Mayor's feasts which have delighted the palates of gourmands since the days of Whittington.

Shortly after he came to Foston, Mr. Smith became a magistrate, formed an acquaintance with the neighbouring squire, who actually discovered that he had made a joke, and laughed himself almost into convulsions; and with his lady who was as stiff and straight as if she had just walked out of the ark, or were the wife of Henoah. In his magisterial capacity he kept a private gallows, and by means of it made great way in reforming juvenile offenders. The dogs were the only animals which utterly defied his authority; he could neither get a congregation of them

together to preach to, nor terrify individual culprits by the sight of his gallows."

"Each farmer," as he told the story at Lord Spencer's house in London, "kept a huge mastiff dog, ranging at large, and ready to make his morning meal on clergy or laity, as best suited his particular taste; I never could approach a cottage in pursuit of my calling, but I rushed into the mouth of one of these shaggy monsters. I scolded, preached, and prayed without avail; so I determined to try what fear for their pockets might do. Forthwith appeared in the county papers a minute account of a trial of a farmer, at the Northampton Sessions, for keeping dogs unconfined; where the said farmer was not only fined five pounds and reprimanded by the magistrates, but sentenced to three months imprisonment. The effect was wonderful, and the reign of cerberus ceased in the land. 'That accounts,' said Lord Spencer, 'for what has puzzled me and Althorp for many years. We never failed to attend the Sessions at Northampton, and we never could find out how we had missed this remarkable dog case.' "

"No," he said, "I don't like dogs; I always expect them to go mad. A lady asked me once for a motto for her dog Spot. I proposed, 'Out damned Spot!' but she did not think it sentimental enough. You remember the story of the French Marquise, who, when her pet lapdog bit a piece out of her footman's leg, exclaimed, 'Ah, poor little beast! I hope it won't make him sick.' I called one day on Mrs. — and her lap-dog flew at my leg and bit it. After pitying her dog like the French Marquise, she did all she could to comfort me, by assuring me the dog was a dissenter, and hated the Church, and was brought up in a Tory family. But whether the bite came from madness or Dissent, I knew myself too well to neglect it, and went on the instant to a surgeon and had it cut out, making a mem. on the way to enter that house no more." Of course he kept his own dogs chained. A young lady seeing this at Combe Florey, his country residence, exclaimed, "Oh, why do you chain up that fine Newfoundland dog, Mr. Smith?" "Because it has a passion for breakfasting on parish boys." "Parish boys!" she exclaimed, "does he really eat boys, Mr. Smith?" "Yes, he devours them buttons and all." Her face of horror made him almost die of laughing. Nothing amused him more than this utter want of the perception of a joke which exists in some minds. A lady who visited him one day spoke of the



oppressive heat. "Heat, Ma'am!" he said; "it was so dreadful here that I found there was nothing left for it but to take off my flesh and sit in my bones." "Take off your flesh and sit in your bones, Sir! Oh, Mr. Smith! how could you do that?" she exclaimed with the utmost gravity. "Nothing more easy, Ma'am; come and see next time." But she considered it such an unorthodox proceeding that she ordered her carriage.

There could scarcely be a more open-minded man than Sidney Smith. "You will," he says, "find a Scotchman always say what is undermost: I, on the contrary, say everything that comes uppermost." Such a man was sure to be loved by his poor parishioners, especially when he united to his open disposition great kindness and benevolence. He not only cast aside all cold formality in his intercourse with them, but carried his freedom from conventional restraint even into the pulpit.

" 'A clergyman,' he says, 'clings to his velvet cushion with either hand, keeps his eye riveted upon his book, and pinions his body and soul into the same attitude of limb and thought, for fear of being called theatrical. The most intrepid veteran of us all does no more than wipe his face with his cambric sudarium; if, by mischance his hand slip from its orthodox gripe of the velvet, he draws it back as from liquid brimstone. Is it wonder, then, that every semi-delirious sectary who pours forth his animated nonsense with the genuine look and voice of passion should gesticulate away the congregation of the most profound and learned divine of the Established Church, and in two Sundays preach him bare to the very sexton! Why are we natural everywhere but in the pulpit? No man expresses warm and animated feelings anywhere else, with his mouth alone, but with his whole body; he articulates with every limb, and talks from head to foot with a thousand voices. Is sin to be taken from man as Eve was from Adam by casting them into a deep slumber? Or from what possible perversion of common sense are we all to look like field-preachers in Zembla, holy lumps of ice, numbed into quiescence, and tognition and mumbling. When I began to thump the cushion of my pulpit, on first coming to Foston, as is my wont when I preach, the accumulated dust of a hundred and fifty years made such a cloud that for some minutes I lost sight of my congregation.' "

He was as intolerant of long as of dull discourses. "Why," he would exclaim, "will not people remember the Flood? If they had lived before it with the patriarchs they might have talked any stuff they pleased; but do let

them remember how little time they have under this new order of things.”

In 1828 Lord Lyndhurst, then Lord Chancellor, appointed Sidney Smith to a vacant stall in Bristol Cathedral. It required no little courage on the part of the Chancellor to brave the opinions and opposition of his own party, and to make one of the ablest and most uncompromising of his political opponents, a dignitary of the church. The very first duty which he was called upon to perform in his new capacity was to preach the usual no-Popery sermon on the 5th of November. A less courageous man might have been satisfied with abstaining from all allusion to the Catholics. But Sidney Smith reversed the proceedings altogether, and poured into the ears of his astonished auditors a powerful discourse in favour of the Catholics upon the very Festival of Intolerance. Writing to Mr. Littleton (Lord Hatherton) two days after the sermon had been preached, he says: “At Bristol, on the 5th of November, I gave the Mayor and Corporation (the most Protestant Mayor and Corporation in England,) such a dose of toleration as shall last them for many a year. A deputation of the *pro-Popery* papers waited on me to print, but I declined.” “He preached,” says one who was present, “finely and bravely on this occasion, in direct opposition to the principles and prejudices of the persons in authority present, and ended by that beautiful apologue from Jeremy Taylor, illustrating charity and toleration, when Abraham, rising in wrath to put the way-faring man forth from his tent for refusing to worship the Lord his God, the voice of the Lord was heard in the tent, saying, ‘Abraham! Abraham! have I borne with this man for threescore years and ten, and canst thou not bear with him for an hour?’”

On the very day on which he had preached he wrote to Lord Holland: “To-day I have preached an honest sermon, (5th of November,) before the Mayor and Corporation, in the Cathedral—the most Protestant Corporation in England! They stared at me with all their eyes. Several of them could not keep the turtle on their stomachs.”

Shortly after his appointment as a Canon of Bristol, Mr. Smith was enabled, through the kindness of his friend, Lord Lyndhurst, to exchange Foston for the beautifully situated living of Combe Florey, near Taunton, in Somer-

setshire. He repaired the parsonage, and resided alternately in this place and in London till his death.

In September 1831, Earl Grey made Mr. Smith a Canon of St. Paul's Cathedral. He tells Mrs. Meynell, "I am just stepping into the carriage to be installed by the Bishop ...It is, I believe, a very good thing, and puts me at my ease for life. I asked for nothing—never did anything shabby to procure preferment. These are pleasing recollections." Lord Grey declared that he had resolved to make him a bishop. When he was appointed Prime Minister he exclaimed, "Now I shall be able to do something for Sidney Smith." No man had ever earned the office so well from his party. His life was blameless; he was perfectly orthodox according to Anglican ideas of orthodox doctrine, and zealous in the discharge of his ministerial duties. In 1818 he wrote to Jeffrey: "I must however beg the favour of you to be explicit on one point. Do you mean to take care that the Review shall not profess or encourage infidel principles? Unless this is the case I must absolutely give up all thought of connecting myself with it." Certain booksellers to whom he was personally unknown were in the habit of making him presents of books. Among these, on one occasion, there happened to be a work in which infidelity was advocated. In thanking the booksellers for their presents in a letter, dated July 30th, 1827, he tells them they must have "overlooked the purpose and tendency of that work, or they would not have sent it to him;" and he takes occasion to remonstrate with them on their intended publication of Voltaire's Philosophical Dictionary, which he saw amongst their advertisements. "I hate," he says, "the insolence, persecution, and intolerance which so often pass under the name of religion, and (as you know) I have fought against them; but I have an unaffected horror of irreligion and impiety; and every principle of suspicion and fear would be excited in me by a man who professed himself an infidel."

He could not accept of an Irish See, because he had cried out all his life against the monstrous injustice of that establishment, and earnestly exhorted Lord Grey to remodel it entirely; and only two English bishoprics fell vacant whilst this nobleman was Prime Minister. One of these was pre-engaged in some way, the nature of which we are not told, and the other was conferred by the king himself

upon Lord Grey's brother, as a mark of his esteem for the minister. As Mr. Smith expressed the matter to a friend at this time, "The upper parsons live vindictively, and evince their aversion to a Whig ministry by an improved health. The Bishop of — has the rancour to revive after three paralytic strokes, and the Dean of — to be vigorous at eighty-two. And yet these are men who are called Christians!"

During Lord Melbourne's administration, the Whigs had abundant opportunities of rewarding the man who had done more to make them ministers than any single individual in England. Lord Melbourne, indeed, regretted that he had not made him a bishop; but this repentance came too late, for it was after he had ceased to be minister. During his administration, Sidney wrote concerning him to Lady Holland: "Lord Melbourne always thinks that man best qualified for any office, of whom he has seen and known the least. Liberals of the eleventh hour abound! and there are some of the first hour, of whose works in the toil and heat of the day I have no recollection." Lord Melbourne was, himself, a case in point, for Sidney truly says that he does not remember to have seen his face while the profession of liberal principles was unprofitable and dangerous. "Pretended heterodoxy," he writes to Lord John Russell (April 3rd., 1837) is the plea with which the Bishops endeavoured to keep off the bench every man of spirit and independence, and to terrify *you* into the appointment of feeble men who will be sure to desert *you* (as all your bishops have lately and shamefully done) in a moment of peril...I defy — to quote a single passage of my writings contrary to the doctrines of the Church of England...I defy him to mention a single action of my life which he can call immoral...I am distinguished as a preacher, and sedulous as a parochial clergyman. His real charge is, that I am a high-spirited, honest, uncompromising man, whom all the bench of bishops could not turn, and who would set them all at defiance on great and vital questions...But I am thoroughly sincere in saying I would not take any bishopric whatever, and to this I pledge my honour and character as a gentleman." His eminent abilities were another very great obstacle to his promotion. "In England," he says, "when a man is a fool we only trust him with the immortal concerns of human beings." Had his promotion depended on any

one individual he would have got it, but as Lord Thurlow once said, "Who ever expected justice from a society? It has neither a soul to be saved nor a body to be kicked." We have no doubt however, that he was a happier man than if he had been made a bishop, and this he repeatedly declared himself during the latter years of his life.

In 1843, by the death of his fellow-canon, Mr. Tate, the very valuable living of Edmonton fell vacant, and by the rules of the chapter it lay with Mr. Smith either to take it himself, or present it to a friend. The late canon, Tate, was the man who had joined him in a minority of two in favour of Catholic Emancipation, against the combined bigotry of the parsons in Yorkshire, during a Tory Administration. Tate's son had officiated for some time as his father's curate, and the utmost hope of himself and of his family, which was almost totally dependent on him, was that he might be continued in his present situation by the new vicar. This hope was, however, so slender that the family were "in daily expectation of being turned out of house and curacy." Young Tate had about as much expectation of being made vicar of Edmonton with house, lands, and eight hundred a year, as he had of being elevated to the throne of Oude. Sydney, however, determined to appoint the son of his brave old colleague to the vicarage if he should find him fit for the office. For this purpose he went to Edmonton, and found that the family consisted of three delicate daughters, an aunt, the old lady and her son the curate, who he thought could be converted into a tolerable vicar. He tells the scene that followed in a letter to his wife, which no man with a particle of sensibility can read without moist eyes.

"I began," he says, "by inquiring the character of their servant; then turned the conversation upon their affairs, and expressed a hope the chapter might ultimately do something for them. I then said 'it is my duty to state to you (they were all assembled) that I have given away the living of Edmonton; and have written to our Chapter clerk this morning, to mention the person to whom I have given it; and I must also tell you that I am sure he will *appoint his curate.*' (A general silence and dejection.) 'It is a very odd coincidence,' I added, 'that the gentleman I have selected is a namesake of this family; his name is Tate. Have you any relations of that name?' 'No we have not.' And by a more singular coincidence, his name is Thomas Tate; in short,' I added, 'there is no use in mincing the matter, you are vicar of Edmonton.'

They all burst into tears. It flung me also into a great agitation of tears, and I wept and groaned for a long time. Then I rose, and said I thought it was very likely to end in their keeping a buggy, at which we all laughed as violently. The poor old lady, who was sleeping in a garret because she could not bear to enter into the room lately inhabited by her husband, sent for me and kissed me, sobbing with a thousand emotions. The charitable physician wept too...I never passed so remarkable a morning, nor was more deeply impressed with the sufferings of human life, and never felt more thoroughly the happiness of doing good."

This man had a heart, but young Tate had none, for he no sooner got himself securely fixed in the parish than, in spite of his benefactor's remonstrances, he turned out his fellow-curate, who by a singular coincidence, was also the son of a former vicar of Edmonton.

Towards the end of his life, Sidney Smith became a rich man. His younger brother spent his years in India in amassing £100,000, came home an old, infirm, solitary man, and died suddenly without making any will. To the third part of this sum Sidney became entitled. "After buying," he says, "into the Consols and the Reduced, I read Seneca 'On the contempt of Wealth.' What intolerable nonsense." This was his creed. To be kind, benevolent, honest, moral, and to enjoy all the good he could get out of the world. He says he felt happier for every pound he got richer. Had he looked into the gospel instead of Seneca, he might have found better reasons for despising wealth. The year before he died he gives this true picture of himself, in a letter dated June 29, 1844. "I am seventy-four years of age; and being Canon of St. Paul's and a rector of a parish in the country, my time is divided equally between town and country. I am living amongst the best society in the Metropolis, and at ease in my circumstances; in tolerable health, a mild Whig, a tolerating Churchman, and much given to talking, laughing, and noise. I dine with the rich in London, and physic the poor in the country; passing from the saucers of Dives to the sores of Lazarus. I am upon the whole a happy man; have found the world an entertaining world, and am thankful to providence for the part allotted to me in it." He laughed even at his own maladies. "Mrs. Sidney," he says to a friend, "has eight distinct illnesses and I have nine. We take something every hour, and pass the mixture from one to the other." "I am only

half recovered," he tells Lord Mahon, "from a violent attack of gout in the knee, and I could not bear the confinement of dinner, without getting up and walking between the courses, or thrusting my foot on somebody else's chair, like the Archbishop of Dublin." He was, in fact, not unlike the portrait he drew of one of his acquaintances: "Going gently down hill, trusting that the cookery in another planet may be at least as good as in this, but not without apprehension that for misconduct here, he might be sentenced to a thousand years of tough mutton, or condemned to a little eternity of family dinners."

He studied comfort in everything. "Very high and very low temperature," he said, "extinguishes all human sympathy and relations. It is impossible to feel affection beyond 78°, or below 20° of Fahrenheit; human nature is too solid or too liquid beyond these limits. Man only lives to shiver or to perspire...I cannot fall into the absurd English fashion of going in open carriages in the months of December and January—seasons when I should prefer to go in a bottle, well corked and sealed."

He was passionately fond of society and always had the lion's share of the conversation. Mc.Auley and he, he said, often as they met, never once heard each other's voice. And when he had finished a good story he would say: "Poor Mc.Auley, he will regret not having heard that." An American lady would not listen, and insisted on having the talk to herself; Sidney revenged himself by describing her as one "who abuses the privilege of literary women, to be plain; and, in addition, has the true Kentucky twang through the nose, converting that promontory into an organ of speech."

Like Johnson he disliked country life, and loved the city only. "The summer and the country," he says, "have no charm for me. I look forward anxiously to the return of bad weather, coal fires, and good society in a crowded city. I have no relish for the country; it is a kind of healthy grave. I am afraid you are not exempt from the delusion of flowers, green turf, and birds; they all afford slight gratification, but not worth an hour of rational conversation: and rational conversation in sufficient quantities is only to be had from the congregation of a million of people in one spot." He cared not for the acquaintance of the vegetable world, and were it not for the interference of friends "would order the roses to be boiled for

dinner, and gather a cauliflower for a nosegay." "The real use of the country," he said, "is to find food for cities; but as for the residence of any man who is neither butcher nor baker, nor food-grower in any of its branches, it is a dreadful waste of existence and abuse of life." "Mrs. Sidney and I," he tells Lady Grey, "have been leading a Darby-and-Joan life for these last two months, without children. This kind of life might have done very well for Adam and Eve in Paradise, where the weather was fine and the beasts as numerous as in the Zoological Gardens, and the plants equal to anything in the gardens about London, but I like a greater variety.....We are expecting some company, but the idea of filling a country house with pleasant people is a dream; it all ends in excuses and disappointments, and nobody comes but the parson of the parish.....I suspect that the fifth act of life should be in great cities; it is there, in the long death of old age, that a man most forgets himself and his infirmities; receives the greatest consolation from the attention of his friends, and the greatest diversion from external circumstances." "We are," he tells his daughter, "going through our usual course of jokes and dinners; one advantage of the country is, that a joke once established is good for ever; it is like the stuff which is denominated *everlasting*, and used as pantaloons by careful parents for their children. In London you expect a change of pleasantries; but M. and N. laugh more at my six-year-old jokes than they did when the jokes were in their infancy."

Amongst his other maladies, he was subject to hay-fever. "My fear is," he says, "perishing by deliquescence; I melt away in nasal and lachrymal profluvia... Light, dust, contradiction, an absurd remark, the sight of a dissenter sets me sneezing; and if I begin sneezing at twelve I do not leave off until two o'clock, and am heard distinctly in Taunton when the wind sets that way,—a distance of six miles."

In 1835 he took his wife and youngest daughter, Mrs. Hibbert, to Paris. To his eldest daughter, Lady Holland, he thus describes the passage from Dover to Calais: "It blew a hurricane all that night, and we were kept awake by thinking of the different fish by which we should be devoured, on the following day. I thought I should fall to the lot of some female porpoise, who, mistaking me for a porpoise, but finding me only a parson, would make a

dinner of me." He often jests about his obesity, but as death approached he began to grow lean. "If," he says, to the Countess of Carlisle, "you hear of sixteen or eighteen pounds of human flesh, they belong to me. I look as if a curate had been taken out of me."

This letter to the Countess of Carlisle, which is the last but one in the volume, was written on the 21st of October, 1844, and he died in London, on the 22nd of February, 1845. We have endeavoured to convey some idea of that exhaustless fund of wit, which renders the volume containing his letters as interesting as a good novel; and to exhibit him as an affectionate husband, a loving father, a faithful friend, and a powerful and unflinching advocate of right and justice. No man ever had an equal power of converting words into "sharp swords," and he was not sparing of his weapons when intolerance was to be beaten down, or cant and hypocrisy to be stripped of the mask and exposed to the scorn of the world.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

I.—*The Annals of Ireland, by the Four Masters.* Consisting of the Irish Text, from the Original MS., and an English Translation, with copious explanatory Notes, and an Index of Names, Places, and Events, By JOHN O'DONOVAN, L.L.D. New Edition (Prospectus). Dublin: Hodges and Smith, 1855.

It is needless for us to say one word in recommendation of this great national undertaking. We have already spoken at great length of the first edition, which was published several years ago. The reprint of that edition now in preparation is to us a source of still higher gratification. It will bring the work within the reach of many to whose means the earlier and more expensive edition was found unsuitable; and while it contains precisely the same matter as the former, and is printed in a style, which, if not equally luxurious, is quite as elegant and substantial, it is issued at a cost from which comparatively humble collectors may not shrink.

To the patronage of our clergy especially, we commend a work which for them possesses a peculiar interest, and which comes before them sanctioned by the unanimous recommendation of the episcopal body.

THE DUBLIN REVIEW.

DECEMBER, 1855.

ART. I.—*Memoirs of the Life, Writings, and Discoveries of Sir Isaac Newton.* By SIR DAVID BREWSTER, K. H. &c. 2 vols. Edinburgh: Constable and Co. 1855.

WE hardly know how far it may be possible for any powers of description, or any charm of style to communicate interest to the biography of a mere philosopher;—of one who is remarkable neither for the more showy grandeur or the more vulgar weaknesses of our nature, whose passions have not been thrown into relief by great events, and whose life has been diversified by no variety of fortune. It may be a fault in our organization, or it may be owing to the influence under which our habits of mind have been formed, that the heroes of science, the explorers of the ocean of natural truth, or the still bolder adventurers that tempt the heights and depths of metaphysical speculation, cannot awaken our curiosity or enlist our feelings to anything like the same extent as a poet, a soldier, a saint, a statesman, a highwayman, or a dozen other equally questionable characters. To those, of course, whose pursuits are identical with his own, the history of the philosopher is full of interest, and that too of the most practical description. In studying the life of a philosopher you necessarily follow, to some extent at least, the history of the science with which he has connected his name; and if the investigations you propose to yourself are of a like character with his, you naturally look to his history for enlightenment and guidance. This is more especially true with respect to the physical sciences, which lie

wholly in induction, and by reason of which circumstance the life of a philosopher like Newton must be little else than a record of his experiments. Sir David Brewster's memoir of Newton was hardly intended, we imagine, to be a popular one in any sense of the word. It would be quite hopeless to exclude those terms of art and scientific disquisitions which render a work of this kind unintelligible to the general public; and if we take into account that Newton's life was a series of successful discoveries and nothing more; that in the man there was much to respect and admire, but not much to attract or attach; that he was transferred from his chair at Oxford to his chair in the Royal Society, and that his fortunes were as uniform as his temper; we shall not be disposed to blame Sir David Brewster for any deficiency of interest, any poverty of description, or absence of scenic effect which may strike us in his pages. Take any philosopher, from Socrates downwards, and make him a hero of romance if you can. Socrates himself, for instance, with his legerdemain method and his sly little witticisms, becomes after awhile as mawkish as one of Wordsworth's milkmaids; as intolerably perfect as Mrs. Barbauld's good children, who deliver whole codes of infantine morality in words of three letters; and but for Xantippe and the Areopagus, would fail to keep us awake for any given time. If Zeno had taken his turn in the ox of Phalaris and submitted his theory of happiness to the test of experience, it would have been an interesting feature in his life no doubt; but, as it is, we are probably entitled to assume that had every philosopher of antiquity, from Pythagoras downwards, a biographer as minute as Boswell and as eloquent as Livy, it would require no ordinary amount of philosophy to get through his life. Even Cicero is no exception, for he was an amateur; philosophy was not his business; and if the life of Bacon has a certain interest, we believe it is owing to the great moral meanness of the man, far more than to his philosophy.

Still, the life of Newton can never be devoid of interest, even for readers absolutely unacquainted with the sciences in which he made such wonderful discoveries, provided they have any tincture of letters. Independently of the relationship and sympathy existing between all the liberal arts, and securing to each one a portion of esteem and interest from the others, the name of Newton, representing,

as it does, an era in physical discovery, is sufficiently great to command universal attention if not universal interest, and to make an acquaintance with the principal events of his life, an essential part of education. The apparently impassive and uniform character which all accounts concur in ascribing to Newton, and in virtue of which he would seem as little susceptible of human feelings or infirmities as one of his own calculating machines, have communicated a coldness and stiffness even to his more amiable virtues ; for it would be a mistake to suppose he had absolutely no kindness of disposition or depth of feeling. There are, to be sure, one or two incidents which somewhat smarten the details of his history, and throw a little animation into the simplicity and repose of his character. His dispute with Flamsteed, to which Sir David Brewster has given quite a different complexion from that which it assumed under the hands of Baily, is of this description : and there are few who have not taken one side or the other in the priority controversy between himself and Leibnitz regarding the discovery of fluxions. Again, by way of set off against the moral rectitude of Newton (not altogether so imposing however as is believed) we meet with errors of judgment the most singular, but which bear their part in exciting our wonder and freshening our curiosity. Newton a believer and all but an adept in alchemy—Newton in quest of the universal elixir or the philosopher's stone, is far more a matter of astonishment and speculation than Wallenstein, a believer in astrology and missing his destiny by faith in his horoscope. But the eccentricities of Newton in religious belief are perhaps more surprising still, if one attempts to reconcile them with that unimpeachable integrity which is claimed for him by his friends, and has generally been conceded without inquiry. The suspicion, that Newton inclined to Unitarian opinions, is now changed into the certainty that he entertained them and expressed them as far as he durst, while he made outward profession of holding the Athanasian doctrine, because, as Sir David Brewster admits with considerable naïveté :—

“ In so far as the opinions of Newton, Locke, and Clarke, all of whom were suspected of Arian tendencies, were hostile to the doctrine of the Trinity, they had *substantial* reasons for keeping them secret. In the Toleration Act, passed in 1668, before Newton had sent his dissertation to Locke, an exception was made of those who

wrote against 'the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity;' and in the act for the suppression of blasphemy and profaneness, it was provided that whoever 'by printing, teaching, or advisedly speaking, denied any one of the Persons of the Holy Trinity to be God,' should 'for the first offence be disabled to have any office or employment, or any profit appertaining thereto.' The expulsion of Whiston from the University of Cambridge, in 1711, for holding Arian tenets, though the Queen did not confirm the censure passed by the convocation, was yet a warning to Anti-trinitarians of every class, who *either held office*, or were desirous of holding it, to refrain from the public expression of their opinions, and we have no doubt that Newton was influenced by motives of this kind when he desired Locke 'to stop the translation and impression of his papers,' and mentioned his design 'to suppress them.' "

Sir David Brewster's present work is an expansion of his previous *Life of Newton*, published in the "Family Library," in 1831, and adapted to the requirements of the scientific rather than of the general reader. Consequently, as we have already remarked, the merely biographical portion as apart from the history of Newton's discoveries is necessarily meagre. This is not surprising. Newton has left so little in the way of anecdote, and whatever little might have existed has been so negligently gleaned by Sir David Brewster's predecessors, that very scanty materials indeed were at his disposal, had he even thought proper to have made his book somewhat more popular in character. He has had the advantage of access to unpublished documents in the possession of the Portsmouth family; and we think it is not overstating the result of his investigations when we say that they have the full effect claimed for them by Sir David Brewster;—that, namely, of relieving the memory of Newton from the charges brought against him by Flamsteed, endorsed by Baily, and if not generally current, certainly nowhere previously refuted. We do not know whether he has been successful to quite the same extent in disproving the alleged insanity of Newton in 1693, for no matter how short a period; while on the other hand it must be admitted that M. Biot, who maintains the affirmative, and on whom the onus of proof is consequently thrown, has by no means proved his own case. This one thing, at all events, the Portsmouth Papers sufficiently establish, that, whatever becomes of the question whether Newton ever was insane, his insanity must have been only momentary, and in no respect dimin-

ished or enfeebled his reasoning powers on their recovery, supposing him ever to have lost them.

The two first chapters of Sir David Brewster's work are those perhaps that contain most of Newton's purely personal history. They take in the interval from the year of his birth, 1642, to the year 1669, when he succeeded Dr. Barrow in the Lucasian chair. The interval was well filled up when it included the discovery of the binomial theorem and fluxions. The author has given fully, and even minutely, whatever is known of Newton's school-boy days; and every one is sufficiently acquainted already with his disinclination for general study and love of mechanical inventions, until his tastes and aptitudes, thus obscurely shadowed out, defined themselves more clearly, and then his life became a course of study, barely interrupted by the hours of indispensable rest and refreshment.

Sir David Brewster's arrangement, if arrangement it can be called, is rather embarrassing. Having thought proper to take up an order different from that naturally suggested by the dates, it would have been more convenient had he apprised the reader of this possibly judicious eccentricity, but as it is we are quite without a key to his plan. He occasionally advances five or six years per saltum, and travels back the interval at his good leisure. It is true that Newton had the germs of several discoveries budding at the same moment, though their fructification was at different periods; and this may perhaps account for the order adopted by the author: but it would appear to us that the chronological series of Newton's discoveries, and his progress in each, according as they came into development, would have been the most satisfactory and intelligible way of placing them before the public. At present the narrative is disagreeably broken, not only by episodic sketches of the history of science, previous to the time of Newton, but by excursions into subsequent discoveries, all which might have found a convenient and appropriate place in an introductory chapter exclusively devoted to themselves. Or, else, on giving us warning, he might have classified Newton's discoveries, and given their history in the order he thought fit. In this way, under the head of pure mathematics, we might have traced the discovery of the binomial theorem, the infinitesimal calculus, and the many beautiful theories of which Newton is the author. Under the head of physical mathematics we could have followed his optical experiments, his theories o

light and gravitation, and their application to astronomy, while the disputes with Hook, Flamsteed, and Leibnitz, might with most advantage perhaps be treated apart,—but to us the order of time, as the simplest, the most natural, and the easiest to follow, would have been decidedly preferable.

Before entering into the detail of Newton's astronomical discoveries, Sir David Brewster devotes a chapter to the history of astronomical science, and therewith of Galileo and the Inquisition. We have neither space nor time at this moment to sift the author's statements; but, in truth, we are spared the trouble, as that has been done by anticipation in an early number of the Review. Sir David Brewster has fallen into the error, (as we charitably suppose it,) of most Protestant writers on the subject, and has spoken of Galileo as having been "charged by the Inquisition with maintaining the motion of the earth and the stability of the sun, and teaching and publishing this heretical doctrine, and attempting to reconcile it with Scripture." He thus goes on to say, that, pursuant to the decree of the Inquisition, Cardinal Bellarmine enjoined Galileo to abjure the forbidden doctrine, and refrain from teaching or publishing it, a sentence in which it is said Galileo acquiesced, formally renouncing his opinions, and undertaking in every respect to carry out the injunctions of the decree. Sir David Brewster then connects the subsequent punishment, if punishment it can be called, of Galileo with the simple fact of his having broken his engagement by the publication of "*The System of the World of Galileo Galilei*." It might be worth while to give a slight summary of the facts stated in the ninth number of the Dublin Review, in refutation of similar, indeed of identical inaccuracies. In the first place, then, the Roman tribunal of the Inquisition is a purely executive office. It does not lie within its province to say what is heresy, but once a doctrine has been decided to be heretical, to say, whether such a doctrine is contained in a given work or in particular teaching. Speaking strictly, too, the Church is no more responsible for the Roman than it was for the Spanish Inquisition; and Sir David Brewster, at least, should not hold the Pope responsible for its proceedings in regard to Galileo, for it is more than insinuated by him that the Pope in this case acted in opposition to his better judgment and feelings. In the second place, —

Galileo was not forbidden to teach the Copernican doctrine, but simply to affirm that it was to be found in Scripture. It is competent for Protestant and Catholic alike to teach the Copernican system, the polarization of light, or any other philosophical theory, but it is allowable for the Protestant alone to find them in the Bible. It was wished to confine Galileo to the field of philosophy, and he was only forbidden to encroach upon theology. It was Galileo himself who forced the question on the Inquisition in the first instance. He pressed forward a special case for the opinion of the court against the advice of all his friends, who told him he had full license to hold the heliocentric doctrine as a mathematical truth, but not to run it at all hazards into the sanctuary, (*purche non s'intrè in sagrestia come se è detto altre volte.*) And then after he had obtained the decision he so earnestly and so unnecessarily courted, a decision which only went the length of forbidding him to maintain the consonance of his doctrine with Scripture, he thought proper to gratify himself with an open and advised contempt of the decision he had solicited, accompanying it with circumstances of contumely and derision for his gracious benefactor; and, to crown all, published his libel under license and approbation of the proper officer, who had never seen the work, and never signified his approval of it. The tribunal does not exist that can afford to have its authority wantonly defied; and, after all, the final sentence had no other object than to humble Galileo, and punish him not for heresy of the intellect, but, so to speak, for heresy of the heart and will, for his outrageous temper, his impracticable obstinacy, and, we regret to add, his strange and unworthy ingratitude.

To return, however, to the life of Newton, we think one of the most valuable features in the present work is the light thrown upon the Flamsteed controversy, by the unedited papers which have come into the hands of Sir David Brewster. In Baily's account, which is in point of fact that given by Flamsteed himself, there are considerable errors, some of which the biographer of Newton could rectify independently of the Portsmouth papers, and to these we do not think it necessary in so short a notice to advert. The charges brought by Flamsteed against Newton are reducible to two, namely, that "Newton *very treacherously broke open* an imperfect copy of the catalogue (Flam-

stead's) of the fixed stars, though it was at his own desire sealed up and delivered into his hands ;" and secondly, that without Flamsteed's knowledge or consent, Newton and his colleagues sacrificed his (Flamsteed's) favourite plan of printing his observations in detail in the order in which they were made. Independently of proof drawn from the nature of the agreement to which Sir Isaac Newton and Flamsteed were both parties, a circumstance has been brought out by the Portsmouth Papers which weakens the credit of Flamsteed to that degree that, as Sir David Brewster remarks, nothing can be admitted on his unsupported evidence. In a word, nothing can be more apparent than that Flamsteed deliberately falsified a letter of his own, in order to give colour to his statements, to the prejudice of Newton. The letter in question was written to Sir Christopher Wren, in apology for the delays which Flamsteed himself had thrown in the way of the publication of the *Historia Cœlestis*, and in which the blame is sought to be fixed upon Newton. In the original letter, preserved amongst Newton's papers, there is found a paragraph which was subsequently cancelled in the copy taken by Flamsteed, and cancelled for the sole purpose of defaming Newton. The suppressed paragraph denied all purpose of delay, and held out a promise of despatch ; the substituted paragraph dictates terms in a somewhat haughty strain, and assumes a tone of injured rectitude. Nothing more is wanting utterly to deprive Flamsteed of credit for whatever he advances on his sole authority. It is within the limits of possibility that he may have been candid and above-board in the rest of the controversy, notwithstanding his departure from truth in this one instance, but the presumption is all the other way, and in common justice to the memory of Newton we are bound to hold that no one of the imputations brought against him by Flamsteed, and reaffirmed by Baily, has been proved in the smallest particular, but that the astronomer royal was betrayed into a course perfectly inconsistent with honour and veracity.

As to the fluxionary controversy, we think we cannot do better than give the result of the author's researches in his own words.

"In studying this controversy after the lapse of nearly a century and a half, when personal feelings have been extinguished and national jealousies allayed, it is not difficult we think to form a

correct estimate of the claims of the two rival analysts, and of the spirit and temper with which they were maintained. The following are the results at which we have arrived :—

“ 1. That Newton was the first inventor of the *Method of Fluxions*; that the method was incomplete in its notation, and that the fundamental principle of it was not published to the world till 1687, twenty years after he had invented it.

“ 2. That Leibnitz communicated to Newton in 1677 his *Differential Calculus*, with a complete system of notation, and that he published it in 1684, three years before the publication of Newton's method.

“ The admission of these two facts ought to satisfy the most ardent friends of the rival inventors; but in apportioning to each the laurels which they merit, new considerations have been introduced into the controversy. Conscious of his priority, Newton persisted in maintaining that the only question was, who was the *first* inventor, and that *second* inventors have little or no honour, and no rights. Upon this principle, which we cannot admit, the whole merit of the new Calculus must be given to Newton, and he undoubtedly claimed it. But at variance with this, there is another principle maintained in modern times, and by distinguished men, which transfers all the merit of an invention or discovery to the person who first gives it to the world. Upon this principle the merit of the new Calculus must be adjudged to Leibnitz. These two extreme principles have not in the present case been adopted by the mathematical world. No writer has urged the second against the claims of Newton, or the first against those of Leibnitz. Priority of invention may be established otherwise than by publication, and the merit of a second inventor, when really such, is intellectually as great as that of the first. There is a merit, however, of a peculiar kind, which must ever attach to the first inventor who freely gives his invention to the public. While society concedes to him a high niche in the temple of fame, it cherishes also a feeling of gratitude for the gift it has received. To a second inventor society owes no obligation.

“ Hitherto we have taken it for granted that Newton and Leibnitz had borrowed nothing from each other, and in stating the result of our inquiry we have supposed this to be true. A very different opinion, however, has been maintained during this controversy. The unquestioned priority of Newton's discoveries has preserved him from the charge of having borrowed anything from Leibnitz except his ideas of notation; but a variety of circumstances, which it is necessary to mention, have given a certain degree of plausibility to the opinion that Leibnitz may have derived assistance even of the highest kind from the previous labours of his rival. At an early period Newton had communicated to his friend orally and in writing the elements or the germ of his method of fluxions, and certainly his discoveries in series had come to be known.

His MSS. were copied, and to a considerable extent circulated in England. The letters and extracts actually communicated to Leibnitz may or may not have contained the information which Newton and his friends considered sufficient to convey to him a knowledge of the method of fluxions; but the fact that he was twice in England, in 1673 and 1676, and was in communication with the mathematicians who then adorned the metropolis of England, justified the idea that either orally or from the circulated MSS. of Newton casually seen, or actually communicated to him, he might have derived that information.

“Had Leibnitz been an ordinary man these views might have had much weight, but his powerful intellect, his knowledge of the subject, and the great improvements which he made in the New Calculus, place it beyond a doubt that he was capable of inventing the differential method without any extraneous aid. His *Theoria Motus Abstracti*, dedicated to the Academy of Sciences in Paris, in 1671, before he visited England, contains, according to Dr. William Hales, ‘no obscure seeds of his differential method,’ and shows in the opinion of Professor de Morgan, that in 1671 it was working in Leibnitz’s mind that in the doctrine of infinitely small quantities lay the true foundation of that approach to the differential calculus, which Cavalieri produced. Another argument in favour of Leibnitz is deduced by Professor De Morgan, from seven MSS. of his, bearing the dates of November 11, 21, 22, 1675; and June 26, July, and November, 1676; one bearing no date, and recently published by Mr. Jerhardt, from the originals in the Royal Library at Hauover. These MSS., of which Professor De Morgan has given a specimen, are, as he says, ‘study exercises in the use of both the differential and integral calculus,’ and, if genuine and correct in their dates, possess a historical interest.”—Vol. ii. pp. 78-81.

Space permitting, we should have been glad to enter into the question of the supposed failure of Newton’s intellect in 1692, consequent upon an attack of phrenitis, which, according to very general belief on the continent, he experienced in that year. To this cause the cessation of his discoveries is usually attributed by continental writers; although it is not pretended that his mind did not resume its powers sufficiently to enable him to pursue his studies, and revise his earlier productions. The temporary derangement of Newton has never been admitted by English authors; and it certainly never was known to the English public, although there were apprehensions entertained on that score by his friends, owing to some very eccentric letters manifestly written when under the influence of nervous depression and excitement, quite incoherent, and

altogether of a character very seriously to disquiet his friends. The story originated in an account given to Huygens by the son of Newton's old friend, Sir John Collins, to the effect that Newton's laboratory, and all his MSS. had been burned, that the shock he received from this unfortunate accident was so great as to affect his reason, and that it took more than a year of the good old remedy of confinement, and a dark room, to qualify Newton once more for his familiar studies, but not for any new enterprise. When stripped of all its colouring, the silence of Newton would appear to be reduced to the nervous depression and excitement we have mentioned, occasioned partly by the burning not of his laboratory and all his MSS., but of one very valuable MS. on optics, which circumstance did so discompose him that, in the words of a resident of the University, whose quaint journal has been discovered by the research of Sir David Brewster, he was not himself for a month. It mainly arose, however, from want of sleep; and was occasioned in a great degree by the anxiety under which he laboured regarding the efforts made by his friends to procure for him some place under government, that might be a mark of the national gratitude, and secure an independence for his latter years, a consummation happily brought about a little later by Lord Halifax, then Mr. Montague. There is no question of medical jurisprudence half so nice as the ascertainment of the presence of insanity, and we hardly think there is an expert at the present day who could decide, on the evidence of his letters and the fears of his friends, whether Newton was what might be called insane for any space of time between 1692 and 1693. This much is certain, his insanity, if any such existed, must have been only momentary and quite partial, for his four letters to Bentley on the metaphysical bearing of his own physical researches, not only give evidence of strong reasoning powers, but of powers of reasoning not unworthy of Newton. We have already alluded slightly to his religious peculiarities. Sir David Brewster is unwilling to pronounce that to be false which the great mind of Newton decided to be true. It is a rather bold application of the "*Malleum cum Platone errare*" to religion; but if Newton, the meridian sun of Bible Christians, rejected the doctrine of the Trinity in his closet, and professed it in public, we need not feel surprised if other Bible Christians are satisfied to substitute

speculation for faith ; and at all events it will account for the easy swearing of those who affirm on the Holy Evangelists that the Pope actually has no spiritual authority within these realms, although constantly complaining of its exercise.

We subjoin an able sketch of Newton's character, which we have abridged as little as possible.

“ Such were the last days of Sir Isaac Newton, and such were the laurels that were shed over his grave. A century of discoveries has since his time been added to science ; but brilliant as these discoveries are, they have not obliterated the minutest of his labours, and have served only to brighten the halo which encircles his name. His achievements of genius, like the source from which they spring, are indestructible. Acts of legislation and deeds of war may infer a high celebrity, but the reputation which they bring is local and transient ; and while they are hailed by the nation which they benefit, they are reprobated by the people whom they ruin or enslave. The labours of science bear along with them, on the contrary, no counterpart of evil. They are the liberal bequests of great minds to every individual of their race, and wherever they are welcomed and honoured they become the solace of private life, and the ornament and bulwark of the commonwealth.

“ The importance of Sir Isaac Newton's discoveries has been sufficiently exhibited in the preceding chapters. The peculiar character of his genius, and the method which he pursued in his inquiries, can be gathered only from the study of his works, and from the history of his individual labours. Were we to judge of the qualities of his mind from the early age at which he made his principal discoveries, and from the rapidity of their succession, we should be led to ascribe to him that quickness of penetration, and that exuberance of invention, which is more characteristic of practical than of philosophical genius. But we must recollect that Newton was placed in the most favourable circumstances for the development of his powers. The flower of his youth and the vigour of his manhood were entirely devoted to science. No injudicious guardian controlled his ruling passion, and no ungenial studies or professional toils interrupted the continuity of his pursuits. His discoveries were, therefore, the fruit of persevering and unbroken study, and he himself declared that whatever service he had done to the public was not owing to any extraordinary sagacity, but solely to industry and patient thought.

“ Initiated early into the abstractions of geometry, he was deeply imbued with her ennobling spirit, and if his acquisitions were not made with the rapidity of intention, they were at least firmly secured, and the grasp which he took of it was proportional to the mental labour which it exhausted. Overlooking what was trivial,

and separating what was extraneous, he bore down with intuitive sagacity on the prominencies of his subject, and having thus grappled with its difficulties, he never failed to entrench himself in its strongholds.

“To the highest powers of invention Newton added what so seldom accompanies them, the talent of simplifying and communicating his profoundest speculations. In the economy of her distributions nature is seldom thus lavish of her intellectual gifts. The inspired genius which creates is rarely conferred along with the matured judgment which combines, and yet, without the exertion of both, the fabric of human wisdom could never have been reared. Though a ray from heaven kindled the vestal fire, yet an humble priesthood was required to keep alive the flame.”

The comparison of Newton with Bacon is especially interesting.

“The method of investigating truth by observation and experiment so successfully pursued in the *Principia*, has been ascribed by some modern writers of celebrity to Lord Bacon ; and Sir Isaac Newton is represented as having owed all his discoveries to the application of the principles of that distinguished writer. One of the greatest admirers of Lord Bacon has gone so far as to characterize him as a man who has had no rival in the times which are past, and as likely to have none in the times which are to come. In an eulogy so overstrained we feel that the language of a panegyric has passed into that of idolatry, and we are desirous of weighing the force of arguments which tend to depose Newton from the high priesthood of nature, and to unsettle the proud doctrines of Copernicus, Kepler, and Galileo.

“That Bacon was a man of profound genius, and endowed with varied and profound talent,—the most skilful logician,—the most profound and eloquent writer of the age which he adorned, are points which have been established by universal suffrage. The study of ancient systems had early impressed him with the conviction that experiment and observation were the only sure guides in physical inquiries: and ignorant though he was of the principles, the methods and the details of the mathematical sciences, his ambition prompted him to aim at the construction of an artificial system, by which the laws of nature might be investigated, and which might direct the inquiries of philosophers in every future age. The necessity of experimental research, and of advancing gradually from the study of facts to the determination of their cause, though the groundwork of Bacon’s method, is a doctrine which was not only inculcated by, but successfully followed by, preceding philosophers. In a letter from Tycho Brahe to Kepler, this industrious astronomer urges his pupil ‘to lay a solid foundation for his views by actual observation, and then by ascending from these, to strive

to reach the causes of thirst ;' and it was no doubt under the influence of this advice that Kepler submitted his wildest fancies to the test of observation, and was conducted to his most splendid discoveries. The reasonings of Copernicus, who preceded Bacon by more than a century, were all founded on the most legitimate induction. Dr. Gilbert has exhibited in his treatise on the magnet the most perfect specimen of physical research. Leonardo da Vinci had described in the clearest manner the proper method of philosophical investigation, and the whole scientific career of Galileo was one continued example of the most sagacious application of observation and experiment to the discovery of general laws. The names of Paracelsus, Van Helmont, and Cardan, have been raised in opposition to this constellation of great names, and while it is admitted that even they had thrown off the yoke of the schools, and had succeeded in experimental research, their credulity and their pretensions have been adduced as a proof that, to the 'bulk of philosophers,' the method of induction was unknown. The fault of this argument lies in the conclusion being infinitely more general than the fact. The errors of these men were founded not on their ignorance, but on their presumption. They wanted the patience of philosophy and not her methods. * * *

"Having thus shown that the distinguished philosophers who flourished before Bacon were perfect masters, both of the principle and practice of inductive research, it becomes interesting to inquire whether or not the philosophers who succeeded him, acknowledged any obligation to his system, or derived the slightest advantage from his precepts. If Bacon constructed a method to which modern science owes its existence, we shall find its cultivators grateful for the gift, and offering the richest incense at the shrine of a benefactor, whose generous labours conducted them to immortality. No such testimonies, however, are to be found. Nearly two hundred years have gone by, teeming with the richest fruits of human genius, and no grateful disciple has appeared to vindicate the rights of the alleged legislator of science. Even Newton, who was born and educated after the publication of the *Novum Organon*, never mentions the name of Bacon or his system ; and the amiable and indefatigable Boyle treats him with the same disrespectful silence. When we are told, therefore, that Newton owed all his discoveries to the method of Bacon, nothing more can be meant than that he proceeded in that path of observation and experiment, which has been so warmly recommended in the *Novum Organon* : but it ought to have been added that the same method was practised by his predecessors, that Newton possessed no secret that was not used by Galileo and Copernicus, and that he would have enriched science with the same splendid discoveries if the name and writings of Bacon had never been heard of."

Equally striking are the observations on the Inductive Process itself.

“ From this view of the subject we shall now proceed to examine the Baconian process itself, and consider if it possesses any secret as an artificial method of discovery, or if it is at all capable of being employed for this purpose even in the humblest works of scientific enquiry.

“ The process of Lord Bacon was, we believe, never tried by any philosopher but himself. As the subject of its application he selected that of heat. With his usual erudition he collected all the facts that science could supply,—he arranged them in tables,—he cross-questioned them with all the subtlety of a pleader,—he combined them with all the sagacity of a judge, and he conjured them by all the magic of his exclusive processes. But after all this display of physical logic, Nature thus interrogated was still silent. The oracle which he had himself established, refused to give its testimony, and the ministering priest was driven with discomfiture from his shrine. This example, in that of the application of his system, will remain to future ages as a memorable instance of the absurdity of attempting to filter discovery by any artificial rules.

“ Nothing even in mathematical science can be more certain than that a collection of scientific facts are of themselves incapable of leading to discovery, or to the determination of general laws, unless they contain the predominating fact or relation in which the discovery mainly resides. A vertical column of arch-stones possesses more strength than the same materials arranged in an arch without the key-stone. However nicely they are adjusted, and however nobly the arch may spring, it never can possess either equilibrium or stability. In this comparison all the facts are supposed to be necessary to the final result, but in the inductive method it is impossible to ascertain the relative importance of any facts, or even to determine if the facts have any value at all, till the master part, which constitutes the discovery, has crowned the zealous efforts of the aspiring philosopher. The mind then returns to the dark and barren waste over which it has been hovering, and by the guidance of this single torch it embraces under the comprehensive grasp of general principles the multifarious and insulated phenomena which had formerly neither value nor connection. Hence it must be obvious to the most superficial thinker, that discovery consists either in the detention of some concealed relation—some deep seated affinity which baffles ordinary research, or of the discovery of simple fact, which is connected by slender ramifications with the subject to be investigated, but which, when once detected, carries us back by its divergence to all the phenomena which it embraces and explains.

“ In order to give additional support to those views, it would be interesting to ascertain the general character of the process, by

which a mind of acknowledged power actually proceeds in the path of successful inquiry. The history of science does not furnish us with much information on this head, and if it is to be found at all it must be gleaned from the biographies of eminent men. Whatever this process may be in its details, if it has any, there cannot be the slightest doubt that, in its generalities at least it is the very reverse of the method of induction. The impatience of genius spurns the restraints of mischance rules, and will never submit to the plodding drudgery of inductive discipline. The discovery of a new fact unfits even a patient mind for deliberate inquiry. Consoious of having added to science what had escaped the sagacity of former ages, the ambitious discoverer invests his new acquisition with an importance which does not belong to it. He imagines a thousand consequences to flow from his discovery: he forms innumerable theories to explain it, and he exhausts his fancy in trying all its possible relations to recognized difficulties and unexplained facts. The views, however, thus freely given to his imagination, are speedily drawn up. His wildest conceptions are all subjected to the rigid test of experiment, and he has thus been hurried by the acumen of his own fancy into new and fertile paths far removed from ordinary observation. Here the peculiar character of his own genius displays itself by the invention of methods of trying his own speculations, and he is thus often led to new discoveries, far more important and general than that by which he began his inquiry. For a confirmation of these views we may refer to the history of Kepler's discoveries, and if we do not recognize them to the same extent in the labours of Newton, it is because he kept back his discoveries till they were nearly perfected, and therefore withheld the successive steps of his inquiries.

* * * * *

“The modesty of Sir Isaac Newton in reference to his great discoveries was not founded on any indifference to the fame which they conferred, or upon any erroneous judgment of their importance to science. The whole of his life proves that he knew his place as a philosopher, and was determined to arrest and vindicate his rights. His modesty arose from the depth and extent of his knowledge, which showed him what a small portion of nature he had been able to examine, and how much remained to be explored in the same field in which he had himself laboured. In the magnitude of the comparison he recognized his own littleness, and a short time before his death he uttered this memorable sentence: ‘I do not know what I may appear to the world, but to myself I seem to have been only like a boy playing on the sea shore, and diverting myself now and then finding a smoother pebble or a prettier shell than ordinary, whilst the great ocean of truth lay all undiscovered before me.’ What a lesson to the vanity and presumption of philosophers—to those especially who have

never found the smoother pebble or the prettier shell! What a preparation for the latest inquiries and the last views of the decaying spirit,—for the inspired doctrines which alone can throw a light over the dark ocean of undiscovered truth!”—Vol. ii. pp. 398-408.

There are very many interesting particulars of the life, and habits, and character of Newton scattered through these volumes, amongst which his wonderful aptitude for study, not only from mental organization, but from physical powers of endurance, are most conspicuous. He seemed to study and discourse functionally, as ordinary mortals eat and sleep, while to him eating and sleeping would seem to have been enforced, and not altogether agreeable duties. Other great men have put themselves under restraint in these particulars, from their knowledge that abstemiousness and temperance generally are indispensable to clearness and vigour of intellect, and that unless you borrow from the hours of repose, half your nominal life is nothing better than death. But this does not seem to have been the case with Newton. He was temperate from instinct. He had no violent passions to disturb the balance of his judgment, no warmth of imagination to lead him into reveries. He thought and reasoned with an effort; he required no mental discipline, for his thoughts presented themselves to him in order, and he had hardly the trouble of classification or arrangement. His morals in the more restricted sense of the word, were quite blameless; his religion, being altogether of the reason, partook as largely as might be expected of the infirmities of reason, when it constitutes itself sole arbitrator of things beyond its reach. It was as cold, though by no means as regular or as massive, a piece of business as Saint Paul's. He hardly ever sought it, he took it up as it came in his way, and occasionally broke the uniformity of philosophical studies. “He very seldom went to the chapel, that being the time at which he chiefly took his repose; as for the afternoon his earnest and indefatigable studies retained him, so that he scarcely knew the house of prayer.” We do not know whether from all this we should say that his religion was purely speculative. That might be considered harsh; but it does appear to us that his morality, his honesty, his simplicity, his generosity, which are ordinarily the fruits of religion, or at least of religious feeling, were in his instance part of the constitution of the man;

that, in fact, they were habitual, and not the offspring of reflection. On the whole, while we hardly allow to Sir David Brewster's book the praise of method, we gladly acknowledge that it is for the most part calmly reasoned and ably written. Good service has been rendered to truth generally, and to the memory of Newton, especially by the industrious researches of the author, and we think that with some few, though to Catholics in particular, rather important drawbacks, both Sir David Brewster and the public have reason to be satisfied with the publication.

ART. II.—*Thom's Statistics of Great Britain and Ireland, 1855.*
Selected from Thom's Irish Almanack and Official Directory.
Dublin, Alexander Thom and Sons, 1855.

SOME politicians take a very gloomy view of our present position as a people, and think that as they see no means of obtaining the legislative measures necessary to secure us a position of permanent comfort and independence here, we ought to emigrate *en masse*. In the sad condition of the country, and the sort of judicial blindness that seems to afflict our masters, it is really difficult to form a positive opinion. We however still adhere to the views which we have always avowed, that the only home of the Gael is on the "Island of Destiny"—and that this is to be theirs for ever. If there have been periods in our history, when the truth or authenticity of the promise said to have been vouchsafed to the first of that race, who reached these shores, might well have been doubted, the present is not a moment to justify such scepticism. Their total extermination has been repeatedly contemplated and attempted by men of different races and religions, by Danes, Normans, and Anglo-Saxons, Pagans, Catholics and Protestants. The Danes came for the final struggle in the time of Brian Boru, with their wives and children, and servants, in the expectation that "the Irish

being exterminated, they themselves would inhabit instead of them that most opulent island,"* and that effort and its defeat at Clontarf so exhausted their power, that they never recovered it, and those who remained here became merged in the native race.

During the whole period from the reign of Henry II. to the Reformation, the extirpation of "the mere Irish" was a permanent object of State policy. They were not regarded as entitled to the common rights of humanity. Norman jurists held the violation of an Irishwoman, or the killing of an Irishman, to be no crime; and there were Norman priests who were so far from regarding the killing of an Irishman as a sin, that they publicly avowed they could kill one, and say mass without going to confession; yet, after a struggle of 400 years the Normans had become "more Irish than the Irish themselves." "Neither the English order, tongue, nor habit was used, nor the king's laws obeyed above twenty miles in compass;†" in that compass there were "but few English inhabitants"—the entire population of the island spoke the native language, and "the Irishmen were never so strong as now."‡ Such was the condition of the country, as described by English officials, when Cardinal Wolsey, and his king, and his deputy, consulted about "the destruction of the whole indigenous race," and the latter thought the main difficulty would be "that of stocking the land anew with inhabitants."§ So hopeless did this project prove, that Henry VIII. gave it up, and adopted the opposite principle, took the Irish people into special favour, and honoured their chieftains with every mark of respect and friendship. Thus ended the Norman speculations by the two races thoroughly blending, the extirpators by anticipation ending by the adoption of the laws, manners, language, and even names of the Gael.

When after the Reformation the Anglo-Saxon race and the Protestant religion became predominant, the effort at

* "Ut Hibernis extinctis ipsi pro ipsis inhabitarent opulentissimam insulam."—Moore, vol. ii. p. 125. quoting Ademar apud Labbe.

† Moore, vol. iii. p. 250.

‡ Lord Surrey's Letter to Wolsey.

§ Moore, vol. iii. p. 246.

extirpation was renewed, and under Cromwell was so near succeeding, that nothing but "pity that would move the stoniest of hearts" at the daily butchery of defenceless men, women, and children, saved a wretched little remnant, who were allowed a certain number of days to go to "Connaught or Hell." It is just 200 years since that allowance was accepted with thankfulness. That remnant soon multiplied, and spread again over the desolate portions of the land, and again was subjected to another approach to extinction by war and famine, and was again saved almost by a miracle. It is now just another century since the still more miserable and reduced remnant, held like Helots in bondage, as hewers of wood and drawers of water—deprived of all civil and religious rights—excluded from all offices and functions in the state—forbidden to own a sod of their native soil as leaseholders or freeholders,—forbiden even like the nigger slaves of America, to seek the advantages of education, were told from the highest seat of judgment in the country, that their existence was not recognized by the law, and was tolerated only by the connivance of the government. The last attempt now just over at extermination in time of peace, with the agencies of "law and order," famine and emigration, seems to have got rid of a greater number of the obnoxious race than any of the former attempts; but though the triumphant cry of the organizers of that effort upon the first great striking evidence of its success was, "the Celtic race is gone with a vengeance," yet the race is not gone, but is more firmly fixed on the soil than it has been for centuries, and those of them who are going away, are likely before long, to return with redoubled love of country and ability to serve it.

That a partial emigration will continue for some years there can be no doubt, but the character and direction of this emigration is a matter of far greater importance to the Catholic Church than to the race of Gadelus. We greatly fear that the Catholic body is too apathetic on the subject, and calculates too much on the unalterable adhesiveness of the Irish race in foreign climes to its fold. Here at home, we watch with suspicion the working of a system in which Catholic youth are placed, with insufficient safeguards, for a few hours a day in the same school or college with Protestant professors and fellow-pupils; but we look calmly and indifferently on a system which

sends them thousands of miles beyond our control, and forces them to associate almost exclusively, and in a subordinate capacity, with persons hostile to their faith. Every step taken by the emigrant is such as the Church should deprecate. The emigrant ship is commonly said to be a regular pandemonium, and the poor emigrants, when they reach their destination, are employed in the lowest drudgery, if women as household servants, if men as "navvies," on canals, railroads, or other public works, and deprived of all opportunity of securing a position of respect and happiness, spiritual or temporal. Even the better class of emigrants, those who can settle as professional men, or shopkeepers, or landowners, are remote from all spiritual superintendence, and in association with persons who are habitually scoffing at the Church. The result in the United States is, that the second generation of Irish settlers become sceptical and indifferent, some of the most virulent of the Know-nothings are Irish—and though there are in the States upwards of 7,000,000 souls of Irish birth or descent; out of the entire population of 25,000,000,—the Catholics, including those of every race, French, Spanish, German, &c., do not amount to 2,000,000. The following extract from a letter which recently appeared in the *Tipperary Free Press*, gives a by no means exaggerated view of the evils of the present system.

"Easton, Pennsylvania, U.S., Aug. 18, 1855.

"May I take this opportunity to entreat of you, dear Rev. Sir, to use your influence to check the insane spirit of emigration to this country, which seems to possess our unhappy people in Ireland? They are rushing on the almost certain ruin of their souls, while their temporal condition is at best but little improved. A full fifth of the number leaving Ireland are laid in strange graves within one year from the day they quit their native shores, and the greater part of the others are soon broken down by the severe labour to which they must apply themselves, and the awful climates which rapidly bring on a premature old age, and hurry the poor victim into a premature grave. From the hour they land to the hour they die they are despised and spit upon, and in thousands of cases they die without the last rites of the Church, or any of the consolations which 'at home' would smooth their dying pillows, and prepare their souls for the solemn moment of departure.

"I have had much experience of the life into which nearly all our people are drawn, and I solemnly believe that if the vessels

which bring them over were suddenly to founder, and carry every creature on board into the depths of the ocean, they would have a better chance of salvation than they have after they have lived for some time in this country. So entirely convinced am I of the fearful havoc of souls, which is the result of coming here, that were Almighty God to give me the power of building a wall of fire around Ireland, to prevent its people from leaving it, it should be built before the ink with which I write this line would dry. For the love of Jesus try to keep your people at home. For every individual you keep you snatch a soul from hell.

"Thanks be to that Divine Master whose sacred livery I am permitted to wear, my congregation here is as moral and exemplary as perhaps any other of the same size in the United States, and still my opinions are as above given.

"Asking your kind prayer and remembrance at the Holy Sacrifice, I am, Rev. dear Sir, your obedient servant,

"THOMAS REARDON."

If the people are to be banished a system ought to be organized which would transport them in groups of families and parishes, together with their parish clergy, and enable them to settle down as regular colonists on townships of their own. They would thus at once assume a position of comfort, respectability, and independence, and be rescued from the degradations, miseries, and perils, incident to the lives of isolated drudges.

The next consideration is, where are they to be located? We for years looked to the United States. But it is obvious that Know-Nothingism will make the States inconvenient for Irish Catholics. The States also prove very unhealthy for natives of this country. We know numbers who went away in the prime of life, and died prematurely. Some Yankee physicians, with whom we have conversed, have ventured an opinion that there appears to be something in the climate or soil injurious to the European races, and that if immigration were to cease, and the Red Indians were to condescend to pick up a little civilization, they would in the course of a few centuries recover the whole of the continent.

The Canadas, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia, seem also unsuited to the natives of this country. A few thrive there, but the great bulk descend prematurely to the grave. Newfoundland was in the last century the place of exile, by process of law, for many an Irishman. It is now chiefly inhabited by persons of Irish descent, but it is too small for any large scheme of emigration.

Australia seems for the present the best location, but we have doubts of its permanent prosperity. It seems subject to the plagues of flies, torrid sands, and bad or no water. The condition of the indigenous race has always been very wretched. Most of them are afflicted with ophthalmia, and the difficulty of procuring the means of subsistence has been so great, that they have been, and are in the habit of procuring abortion, and rearing only very few of their male children. We had seen this stated many years back in a work on the colony, and meeting a few months ago a gentleman who had just returned thence, we learned that it is still known, or rather believed, to be the habit of the natives, and that certainly somehow or other, the greater part of the young males disappear. When the natives have been for years resorting to such unnatural practices, it is an indication that food is not very abundant, and we fear that when the gold mines are exhausted, the settlers there will begin to think it is not the most desirable of quarters.

What shall we say of Spain? About four years ago we saw in a country paper the following announcement:

“The Spanish Government have conceded a grant of 250 square miles of country on the banks of the Guadalquivir, in the provinces of Andalusia and Estremadura, containing 160,000 acres of land, of the richest quality, to be colonized by Irish settlers, and exempt from taxation for twenty-five years. The district in question, depopulated by the expulsion of the Moors, has never since been fully occupied.”

Spain, of all countries, can best appreciate the loss or gain of inhabitants. In the time of the Moors it is said to have had a population of 30,000,000. At the close of the Moorish wars 2,400,000 Moors were obliged to leave *en masse*, and soon afterwards more than half a million of Jews were driven out; altogether just about the numbers lost to Ireland by and through the famine. On the discovery of America and its golden treasures, the people rushed in such numbers across the Atlantic, that the government was obliged to pass severe laws against emigration. But they were of no avail. The people fled to the El Dorado of the west, and left the plains of Spain to entailed and incumbered landlords and oppressive tax gatherers; and when the colonies which they formed became independent, the mother country found herself

reduced almost to her original limits, with a scanty, discontented, tax-burthened population of ten or twelve millions. The Spanish government would no doubt treat with a small colony from this country, but it could not spare land enough for all who are disposed to go in quest of new settlements. The county of Clare alone has just as much waste land improveable for cultivation and pasture, (besides 136,000 altogether "irreclaimable," as all Andalusia and Estremadura can spare to us.

If the government could be induced to promote the real welfare of the people, there would be no need to emigrate. We have land enough at home for at least five times our present population; some think for fifty millions; Sir Robert Kane thinks for 20,000,000; and the late ambassador of the French Republic, A. De Beaumont, thinks for 25,000,000. O'Driscoll shows that the population was far greater in the eighth and ninth centuries than it is at present. He says—

"If we are struck with the number of schools and colleges, the names of which, and of the teachers, and the numbers of the students, are in many instances handed down to us, all which appear in our age to be very astonishing, we shall be equally surprised if we consider the vast number of bishoprics, or we should now call them rectories or parishes, into which the country was divided, and which proves beyond a doubt a high degree of national prosperity, and a population greatly exceeding what we consider to be an excess at the present day. A single parish of our time, in most parts of Ireland, and which is considered as affording only an extent of space and population adequate to the maintenance of one clergyman, in the ancient times we refer to, supported three, four, five, or six bishops or rectors, and was divided into as many parishes, having each its parish church. There is no doubt of this fact, for the names of the ancient parishes, so grouped together to form one modern parish, are on record, and in many instances the ruins of the churches may still be traced."*

In short, is there any sober thinker who would maintain that our population is excessive if our material resources were to be developed? A glance at the following figures will set all doubt at rest.

* Hist. of Ireland, vol. i. p. 28.

	Acres.
The superficial area of this country, embraces according to the census of 1841,	20,808,271
Of these there are, covered with water,	630,825
Leaving a surface of land of	20,177,446
Of this surface towns occupy,	42,929
And plantations,	374,482
Leaving available for cultivation,	19,760,035

Of these again there were,

Waste or uncultivated,	6,295,735
Arable or cultivated,	13,464,300

In 1841 there was no separate return made of the land in tillage. Returns of this kind commenced in 1847; those for 1854, show that all the land then in tillage, (strictly so-called,) comprised only 4,310,659 acres. Namely,

	acres.
Under cereal crops,	2,742,154
Under green crops,	1,417,533
Under flax,	150,972

In the return meadow and clover are put down together under the head of crops, but this is a great oversight, as most of the best meadow land in the country never has been tilled, and cannot be tilled, and what is desirable to be known is the amount of land actually undergoing the process of culture. This, we hope, will be remedied in the next returns. However "meadow and clover" covered only 1,257,717 acres, thus leaving altogether under "crops" only 5,568,376 acres, the residue in pasture being 7,895,924 acres.

Of the pasture lands of this country there are probably from one million to a million and a half so naturally fertile as to require no culture or attention of any kind, beyond fencing and keeping the cattle off them during the wet seasons of the year. Suppose these lands to amount to even 1,895,924 acres, there remains 6,000,000 acres of ordinary pasture, which require irrigation, manuring, and other artificial modes of "*amendment*." The comparative unproductiveness of this class of pasture land is a matter of notoriety. Colonel Blacker estimated that in Armagh, which has undoubtedly the best cultivation and smallest farms in the country, half the land was "*nominally in grazing, but in reality producing nothing*," and that

one acre, which in pasturage scarcely afforded one cow a sufficiency of food for more than half the year, would, if tilled and planted with turnips, fatten four head of ordinary sized cattle.* So the Rev. Mr. Hickey,† and Cobbett,‡ show that an acre of ground, which in grass could not feed one cow through the year, could, being tilled on the green crop system, support four. This is the common estimate of all agriculturists. Hence it appears that more than 6,000,000 acres nominally cultivated are little better than waste, while considerably more than 6,000,000 are avowedly waste.

The folly of leaving so much land not only unproductive, but actually injurious to society, has been long apparent to our rulers. So far back as 1772, when “Papists” could not take a lease of any other land, a statute was passed empowering them to take, and landlords with limited estates, to give leases for sixty-one years of bogs and wastes, with half an acre of dry land adjoining, to delve for gravel. In 1809 an act was passed appointing a commission to inquire into the nature and extent of these wastes, and their reclaimability, and this commission made four reports. Select committees of the House of Commons in 1819, 1823, and 1835, recommended the reclamation of these wastes. The Devon Commission urged the importance of it, and the Irish Waste Lands Improvement Company thought to convert them into an El Dorado, but failed.

The Devon Commissioners obtained from Mr. Griffith, the government engineer, and General Valuation Commissioner, “a return of the probable extent of waste lands in every county in Ireland.” This return is a most instructive commentary on the outcry about a “surplus.” We lay it before our readers with elisions and additions. First we strike out two columns specifying the acres 800 feet above the level of the sea, and those below that level, and we substitute for them two columns, one of the total area in

* An Essay on the Improvement to be made in the cultivation of small farms by the introduction of green crops, and house-feeding the stock thereon. By William Blacker, Esq., Dublin, 1834.

† Hints to Small Farmers. By Martin Doyle.

‡ Cottage Economy.

to acres of each county, and the other of the total area of crops in 1854, and we add a final column of the total value of each county, according to Griffith's return, so that the reader may see at a glance the acreage of the entire county of each county, and its present value, the number of acres producing food, and the number absolutely waste, may then work out by the rules of arithmetic the value per "nominally in pasture, but in reality producing nothing."

COUNTIES.	Total area in statute acres.	Total extent under crops in 1854.	Total Waste.	Improv-able for Cultiva-tion.	Improv-able for Pasture.	Unim-provable.	Annual amount of Griffith's valuation, £
ADAMS.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	£
Ar.	221,342	81,370	32,000	17,000	6,000	9,000	166,739
B.	226,214	106,007	19,000	1,500	6,000	11,500	1,041,815
C.	48,437	139,947	52,000	16,000	31,000	5,000	290,550
D.	509,712	181,914	21,000	7,500	6,000	7,500	366,831
E.	493,985	118,723	146,000	45,000	94,000	7,000	233,741
F.	269,409	81,416	59,000	18,000	38,000	3,000	150,785
G.	201,906	109,234	15,000	3,000	5,000	7,000	202,490
H.	579,811	200,487	16,000	6,000	8,000	2,000	529,751
I.	414,824	148,195	69,000	18,000	26,000	25,000	250,015
J.	453,465	124,010	56,000	18,000	37,000	1,000	290,606
K.	576,588	244,211	45,000	16,000	18,000	11,000	391,336
L.	500,172	119,795	201,000	20,000	70,000	111,000	2,196,4
Total.	4,876,211	1,666,341	731,000	186,000	345,000	200,000	4,156,623
M.	762,453	230,918	177,000	40,000	70,000	67,000	487,883
N.	328,076	170,111	35,000	12,000	13,000	10,000	241,908
O.	477,360	168,860	72,000	20,000	28,000	24,000	250,726
P.	1,195,443	232,126	769,000	150,000	250,000	369,000	225,049
Q.	611,919	307,825	78,000	20,000	30,000	28,000	455,697
R.	457,195	106,076	115,000	40,000	50,000	25,000	170,668
S.	518,595	172,102	181,000	50,000	60,000	71,000	220,430
T.	319,757	150,750	21,000	7,000	8,000	6,000	203,348
U.	806,640	270,167	312,000	80,000	120,000	112,000	277,556
Total.	5,475,438	1,808,935	1,760,000	419,000	629,000	712,000	2,533,265
V.	1,566,354	227,615	708,000	160,000	250,000	298,000	453,284
W.	392,363	82,604	116,000	30,000	36,000	50,000	120,920
X.	1,363,881	178,981	800,000	170,000	300,000	330,000	299,852
Y.	607,691	129,276	130,000	40,000	80,000	10,000	289,011
Z.	461,755	95,006	152,000	30,000	60,000	62,000	190,653
Total.	4,392,043	714,385	1,906,000	430,000	726,000	750,000	1,353,720
AA.	827,994	154,642	296,000	60,000	100,000	136,000	313,801
AB.	1,846,333	471,124	466,000	100,000	150,000	216,000	1,150,643
AC.	1,186,126	144,049	727,000	150,000	250,000	327,000	274,576
AD.	680,842	191,669	121,000	30,000	40,000	51,000	517,491
AE.	1,061,731	301,476	178,000	50,000	60,000	88,000	769,389
AF.	461,543	115,755	105,000	20,000	30,000	55,000	152,680
Total.	6,064,577	1,378,715	1,893,000	390,000	630,000	873,000	3,378,580
ABSTRACT.							
ADAMS.	4,876,211	1,666,341	731,000	186,000	345,000	200,000	4,156,623
B.	5,475,438	1,808,935	1,760,000	419,000	629,000	712,000	2,533,265
C.	4,392,043	714,385	1,906,000	430,000	726,000	750,000	1,353,720
D.	6,064,577	1,378,715	1,893,000	390,000	630,000	873,000	3,378,580
Total.	20,808,271	5,568,376	6,290,000	425,000	2,330,000	2,535,000	11,422,188

* Including property exempted from local taxation.

Accompanying Mr. Griffith's tabular return to the Devon Commission, there is a detailed commentary on the waste of each county, and this shows that what Mr. Griffith considered "unimproveable" would, probably, in the hands of a peasant proprietary, be very speedily reclaimed. If the celebrated Pays de Waes were left to Mr. Griffith and the Board of Works, it would be to this day in all its native barrenness. A few extracts will illustrate his notions of the "unimproveable."

"From the foregoing it would appear that the twelve counties of the province of Leinster contain 731,000 acres of land in a state of nature. Of this extent it is probable by judicious arrangements that about 186,000 acres may be drained and cultivated to advantage so far as to produce both corn and green crops; 345,000 may be improved by draining at a moderate expense, and thus rendered available as pasture for sheep or young cattle, and 200,000 acres situated chiefly in elevated and rocky districts must be considered as wholly unimprovable, *at least such as would not remunerate the undertaker.*"

Of the province of Ulster he does not give such a *resumé raisonnée*, but of one of its counties he says:—

"It is probable that within the limits of the County of Donegal there are about 150,000 acres which might be improved for cultivation, 250,000 might be drained and thus rendered available for the rearing of young cattle; and 369,000 acres of mountain-land, *which, it is probable would not repay the expense of draining.*"

Of the province of Connaught he says, it "contains on the whole about 1,906,000 acres of unimproved pasture land, of which about 430,000 might be drained and reclaimed for cultivation, 726,000 might be drained for pasture, chiefly for young cattle, and 750,000 acres *may be considered as not capable of improvement at a remunerative cost.*"

"And Munster," he says, "contains about 1,893,000 of unimproved mountain or boggy land; of which 390,000 may be advantageously reclaimed for cultivation, 630,000 acres may be drained for pasture and coarse meadow; and 873,000 may be considered as *unsuitable for improvement at the present time.*"

Of the entire 6,290,000 acres of waste, he thinks "1,425,000 acres might be advantageously reclaimed and improved so as to produce both corn and green crops; 2,330,000 acres might be drained for coarse meadow toge-

ther with pasture for sheep and young cattle, and 2,535,000 acres *would appear to be unsuitable for improvement inasmuch as it would not repay the expense of effective draining.*”

The great advantage which society would derive from the reclamation of these tracts is exemplified by one example taken from the summary of the county of Cork, where wastes “which were valued for sale at the rate of 4d. per acre per annum ;” “have been since successfully improved under the direction of the Commissioners of Woods and Forests,” and “now vary in value from 7s. 6d. to 20s. per acre.” Let us suppose that all the wastes are on an average worth a rent of 1s. an acre per annum now, and could be reclaimed so as to be worth 20s., and the clear gain to society (the rent being considered only a third of the entire annual value) would be upwards of £18,000,000 a year. That is to say, society in Ireland would have £18,000,000 a year more to spend, to enjoy, and contribute to the general resources and revenues of the kingdom than at present. The importance of this, even in an imperial financial view is well indicated in the report of the Poor Law Inquiry Commission of 1837. Speaking of the Poor Law and the measures of amelioration to which it would, they fancied, necessarily lead, they say :

“What ought to be done we trust will be done ; the improvement of Ireland is of the deepest importance to every part of the United Kingdom ; at present with a population nearly equal to half that of Great Britain, she yields only about a twelfth of the revenue to the State that Great Britain does ; nor can she yield more till more she has to yield. Increased means must precede increased contributions, and to supply Ireland with these, is the great object of our recommendations. We anxiously hope that they may conduce to it, and that Ireland may at length become, what Sir William Temple so long ago declared that by wise and judicious government it would become, the right arm of the empire.”

These are the views which have always influenced our suggestions for the material improvement of this country, but we confess we begin to think that there is some spell upon our rulers, that prevents them from exercising any common sense in the administration of our affairs. It may be an interposition of Providence to keep alive, by

their folly and injustice, our ancient love of nationality, and to secure the fulfilment of the prophecy, that this land should belong to the Gael for ever. Indeed, in any other way it is difficult to account for the singular obstinacy with which they have persevered in doing what they ought not to have done, and leaving undone what they ought to have done.

The first practical question with regard to the wastes is, Ought the landlords to be allowed to lock up this immense quantity of land from society, to put society to the expense of protecting it for them, and not themselves to pay a farthing towards the cost of its protection? A tract of bog, which feeds only a few hares or grouse, really costs society more for its protection than the richest corn fields, inasmuch as game is, of all sorts of property, the most difficult of protection; and every piece of land, even the wildest heath, has the full benefit of the protection of her Majesty's horse, foot, and artillery, just as much as if they were posted on its boundary ditches, with swords drawn, bayonets fixed, and matches lighted. Towards the expense of these costly appliances the owners of our wastes do not contribute a shilling, for there is no Land Tax here, and these wastes producing nothing do not bring the owners within the grasp of the Income tax, or the Succession Duty collector. Neither do they pay Poor rates, County rates, tithes, excise duties, or in short, contribute anything whatever to the local or general revenue. If the common law of England, as Sir E. Coke says, favours tillage, certainly the Statute law of Ireland favours waste.

All the attempts at reclamation hitherto made have been failures, simply because they were confined to enabling and permitting the landlords to reclaim, and the people had no right to do anything but to look on. Time enough has been lost on this folly, and some effective step should be at once taken. The reclamation of these wastes is of more importance to the state than the making of any bridge, canal, or railway, and the private caprices or interests of the owners ought to be made to give way to the paramount interest of society. We are not without authority for this position. Mr. Sergeant Byles, in his *Sophisms of Free Trade*, in commenting on the sophism that we are not to interfere with a man's management of his own property, says,—

“Non-cultivation, or even improper or imperfect cultivation, should with proper guards and regulations be a ground of forfeiture or escheat to the public.

“Ought an Irish landlord, *like the dog in the manger*, to own land of which he can make no use at all, but on which thousands of his fellow-countrymen might live and be happy?”

So Mr. Kay indicates the folly of not taking the matter out of the hands of the landlords.

“Nearly one-third of this rich island is wholly uncultivated, and is nothing more than bogs, moors, and waste lands ; the cultivation of the remaining part is generally of the most miserable kind. Most of the great proprietors have no spare capital to invest in the improvement of their estates, or in bringing any of their waste lands into cultivation. Few, even of those who have capital, are energetic or intelligent enough to expend it in so rational a manner. Many, if not most, of the resident landlords in the south and west of Ireland, are a jovial, careless, hunting set of squires, who think and care ten times more about their sports than about their lands or tenants, while the farmers, and under-lessees of the farmers, will not invest capital in the cultivation of their lands, or in reclaiming the bogs, because they have no leases, and no security for the outlay, and because they do not feel sufficient interest in the land of another to induce them to expend their own savings in improving it ; but instead of doing so have often, as is well known, placed their spare capital, from the want of better investment, in the banks of Ireland, or of England. Many of the squires would willingly sell part of their lands, in order to get capital to improve the other part, while nearly all the larger farmers have spare capital, and would willingly and gladly purchase land and improve it, but both parties are prevented by the present laws relating to land.

“Nor is civilisation in Ireland merely stationary; it is actually going backwards. In the last few years hundreds of thousands of acres have actually been thrown out of cultivation, owing, on the part of the landlords, to inability to sell, and to want of capital and activity ; and on the part of the farmers to want of security, and to being prevented purchasing any part of the strictly entailed estates.”—pp. 305-11.

Mr. Kay's work was published four years ago, but notwithstanding the paragraphs from time to time in the newspapers respecting the wonderful improvement of the country, the agricultural statistics show that the above statement is literally correct at this day, and that year by year the land is turned from tillage to pasture and waste. Thus “the entire breadth of land under crops in 1853 was

5,696,951 acres, which is less by 42,263 acres than that in 1852, and the extent in 1852 was less by 119,737 acres than in 1851.”* The following abstract of the agricultural statistics for 1854 shows a further falling off to the extent of 128,575 acres.

“ ABSTRACT OF CEREAL CROPS.

	Acres. 1853.	Acres. 1854.	Acres. Increase.	Acres. Decrease.
Wheat,	326,896	411,423	84,527	—
Oats,	2,157,849	2,043,466	—	114,383
Barley, Bere, Rye, &c.,	348,642	287,265	—	61,377
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Total,	2,833,387	2,742,154	—	—
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Decrease on Cereal Crops,		91,233 Acres.		

“ ABSTRACT OF GREEN CROPS.

	Acres. 1853.	Acres. 1854.	Acres. Increase.	Acres. Decrease.
Potatoes,	898,733	989,435	90,702	—
Turnips,	339,377	329,106	—	70,271
Other Green Crops,	120,133	98,992	—	21,141
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Total,	1,418,243	1,417,533	—	—
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Decrease on Green Crops,		710 Acres.		

“ GENERAL SUMMARY.

	Acres.
Decrease on Cereal Crops,	91,233
Do. on Green Crops,	710
Do. on Flax,	23,607
Do. on Meadow and Clover,	13,025
	<u> </u>
Total Decrease in the extent of Land under Crops,	128,575”

Another proof of this general decline is furnished by the return of the flax crop for the last year, which presents a falling off of 54,297 acres, the entire amount for 1854, which showed a decrease on 1852 of 23,607 acres, being only 150,972 acres.†

* Thom. p. 91.

† As this paper was passing through the press we received the Agricultural Statistics of 1855, which shew an increase of 112,382 acres under crops, but of these 53,873 were under the head “meadow and clover.”

The late Master in Chancery, Mr. Lynch, who was as chary of the rights of landlords as any man need be, also thought that the state should not leave the reclamation of these wastes to the option and caprice of the present owners. He studied this subject more than any other man of his time, was chairman of the Committee of 1835, and proposed a measure on the subject, which, like most good ones for Ireland, fell still-born from his hands. Of this measure, and the measure that might become necessary, he thus speaks:—

“The measure I proposed is merely permissive. Compulsion in matters of this kind, except where actually necessary, should not be adopted, and in this case, with the inducements held out, and with the reactive influence of the Poor Law, I do not think it necessary, *at least for the present*. The landlords of Ireland never had before a Poor Law, impelling them to action and improvement, and to look after their estates and waste lands. *But if after a few years these wastes are not reclaimed, then I think the legislature would be justified in passing a compulsory law*. The owners of these lands cannot be allowed to say, We shall not improve these lands, neither shall we avail ourselves of the legislative facilities that are afforded us. Our lands shall lie idle and unproductive. Such a course would be a breach of the social compact, and as it would be materially detrimental to their own interests, we cannot suppose it will be pursued.”*

Mr. Mill is strong against the right of the landlord class to keep these wastes in their present barrenness, and scouts the cant about “sacredness of property” as an impediment to their reclamation. He says,—

“When the ‘sacredness of property’ is talked of, it should always be borne in mind that this does not belong in the same degree to land as to other property. NO MAN MADE THE LAND. It is the original inheritance of the whole people. Public reasons exist for its being appropriated. But the distinction is vast between property in land and in moveables which are the product of labour. The latter should be absolute, except where positive evil to society would result from it. But in the case of land, no exclusive right should be permitted to any individual which cannot be shown to be productive of positive good.”

“The community has too much at stake in the proper cultivation of the land, and in the conditions annexed to the occupying of it, to

* Measures for Ireland, p. 57.

be justified in leaving these things to the discretion of a class consisting of but a portion of the community, when they have shown themselves unfit for the trust."

He adopts the suggestion of Thornton that the wastes should be bought up by the Crown and drained and intersected with roads, and then allotted in small farms to the peasantry in perpetuity, the interest of the sums so expended being charged on each allotment "when reclaimed, as a perpetual quitrent, redeemable at a moderate number of years' purchase."

Mr. Poulet Scrope thinks that the true rule of public right with respect to the ownership of the lands of a state is that of industrial occupation, and quoting the observation of Blackstone, "As it was *occupancy* which gave a right to the temporary *use* of the soil, so it is agreed upon all hands that *occupancy* gave also the original right to a permanent property in the substance of the earth itself," he adds,

"It is clear that it must be *industrial* occupancy or *use* that can alone confer this right, since otherwise the principle is unintelligible. No man, strictly speaking, *occupies* land which he puts to no use, or turns to no advantage, public or private. It could never be that any one by merely *saying*, 'I take possession of this or that tract of land,' could establish a just title to its permanent ownership. No one could be entitled to appropriate from the *common stock* more land than he was enabled to, and actually did, make a *beneficial use* of."*

"The Institutes of Menu, which are of vast antiquity, and prevailed very generally throughout Asia, declared that any one was entitled to reclaim, fertilize, and cultivate waste land, and whoever did so thereby established a title to it as his property, on due registration of the fact. In China this law is still in force. In the absence of this fundamental law, the most fertile districts of those tropical climes, where costly works of irrigation are necessary to render the land productive, would probably have remained to this day mere jungles, the abode of wild animals alone."†

He thus strongly contrasts the effects of the Institutes of Menu and Confucius with those of the Statutes at Large.

"Ireland has, beyond the eleven millions of acres of land in the

* p. 8.

† The Irish Land Question.

island nominally in cultivation—that is, cropped, but wretchedly managed for the most part—four or five other millions of acres, *still in a state of nature*, absolutely wasted, though known to be capable of productive and profitable reclamation—but which the starving people are neither set to work upon by the law-made owners of these wastes, nor permitted to cultivate for themselves, except in rare instances, and on terms such as almost forbid the hope of living upon the bargain! Everywhere throughout Ireland is to be seen the spectacle of lands wanting labour only to produce abundance, and labour either perishing from want of employment, or fed in unproductive idleness on forced levies from property. While the law which compels the maintenance of the idle labourers, at the same time interdicts their putting a spade into the undrained, untilled, and wasted lands around them.....These form together a social system capable of transforming Paradise itself into a desert.”—p. 25.

As a means also of settling or staving off the Tenant Right Question, the reclamation of the wastes would be a good expedient. The present government have avowed their disinclination to meddle with that question, and their opinion that the law of Landlord and Tenant, as now established, should be like those of the Medes and Persians. The reclamation of the wastes would therefore be to them the easiest and pleasantest way in the world of getting rid of that difficulty. Mr. Thornton, in his “Plea for Peasant Proprietors,” written in 1848, points out this as follows:—

“The only unobjectionable way of enabling tenants to obtain reasonable terms from their landlords, is to diminish the competition for land, by lessening the number of competitors. There are at present in Ireland nearly half a million of farms large enough, if held on leases, and at fair rents, to maintain the actual tenants in plenty and comfort; and there are about 400,000 smaller holdings, which might be consolidated and redistributed into 130,000 farms of eight acres each. Moreover, the farms of more than twenty acres each are 202,260 in number, comprehending about fifteen millions of acres, which would furnish occupation for about 120,000 families, in addition to those of the occupiers. Thus of the whole number of agricultural families which, in 1841, was 974,000, but which must have been considerably reduced by the famine and pestilence of the last two years, and does not probably now exceed 950,000, about 750,000 might obtain a competent livelihood from the land actually under cultivation, if relieved from the competition of the 200,000 families remaining. These last constitute a redundant population, which must be withdrawn from a field of employment in which while they have not room to work themselves,

they are always in the way of their neighbours. But whither can they be removed? Emigration cannot dispose of such multitudes, nor can they betake themselves to the sedentary occupations of towns. The employment afforded to them must be agricultural, and must be procured in Ireland, yet not on the land already under cultivation. Where, then, can they be provided for? The question admits of but one answer, They must be transferred to the waste lands.

“Of such lands Ireland contains 6,290,000 acres, of which 2,535,000 are said not to be worth the cost of improvement, but 1,425,000 are acknowledged to be improveable for tillage, and the remaining 2,330,000 for pasture. These wastes are scattered over the whole island, but it fortunately happens that they are most extensive in those counties in which there is the largest amount of destitution.”—p. 216.

The only question now remaining is, what particular measure should be adopted to render the wastes available to society? First, it is obvious that the law should be so altered as to allow of the summary sale of wastes for arrears of Poor Rates, County Rates, Tithes, and other first charges, without the idle, costly, and dilatory process of suits at law and in equity, and inquiries about the title, and total failure if no title can be established. As there is no fact to be controverted, there should be no litigation. If a certain public tax is due of a particular piece of land, the land should be sold by summary process, without inquiry as to the owner, real or imaginary, as in the United States, France, and all countries where the Civil Law prevails, in the Bedford Level, in most English towns, which have recently adopted improvement acts, and London itself, under the Local Management Act of last session.

As the system of the Bedford Level seems the most perfect with which we are acquainted, we may state once more a few of its details. The Level has been reclaimed, and is preserved from the sea by means of high and strong dikes, which require constant repairs. These repairs must be paid for by those who hold the lands protected by them, and for this purpose a tax of so much per acre is imposed every spring at a meeting of the trustees. Public notice is given of this tax, and it is required to be paid at the office of the receiver before the end of June. If not paid by that time, it will not be received without a certain small addition for interest, and if not paid by the end of Septem-

ber it will not be received without a heavier amount of interest, and certain expenses. If the parties do not pay by that time, notice is given on the door of the Court House of Ely, that the lands are in arrears for the tax, and if this publication do not enforce compliance, notice is given of the *lands* in default in the Cambridge and other local papers, a certain time before the annual meeting of the trustees at Ely, in the month of March. If by that day the tax, with interest, and all incidental expenses, is not paid, the lands are set up to a sort of Dutch auction. The amount to be paid is a fixed quantity, and the biddings being for so much of the land as the bidders are willing to take for it, biddings gradually fall till the last bidder is he who offers to take the *minimum* quantity of land. He is then put into possession by the trustees, and his title is absolute against the world, the Court of Chancery, or any other court, not being allowed to molest him. There is no trouble in recovering the rates. There is no distraining of tenants, no scenes of any kind, and the tenants may, if they like, attorn to the new purchaser, and hold on in undisturbed possession. This system is better than that of the United States, where the purchase is liable for the space of two years to be redeemed by the former owner on payment of the purchase money, with interest at twenty per cent per annum, and where also his title is liable to be defeated for non-compliance with certain of the preliminary formalities.

Another just mode of forcing the owners of wastes into cultivation, would be to impose a fair share of any additional war taxes upon them, in the shape of a tax on every acre tilled or untilled in the island, with a like summary power of sale.

By the present system of taxation nearly all the excise duties are borne by the small portion of land in tillage, the pasture and waste being favoured by exemption from taxes. Indeed, the excise duties are borne almost exclusively by the one-ninth of the surface of the island, whose produce forms the basis of the malt and spirit duties. Thus the excise duties in 1854 were £1,865,385 : 9 : 4½, of which £1,479,964 : 8 : 6¾ arose from spirits, and £210,005 : 1 : 8¾ from malt, while only 2,330,731 acres were under oats, barley, bere, rye, &c. If these duties were abolished, and an acreable land tax were imposed in lieu of them, it would, in addition to freeing industry from

restrictions, and restoring a just equality of taxation, force quantities of the wastes into the market, and consequently into cultivation.

But the main measure should be a recognition of the principle that tillage is of as much importance to society as travelling, and the application of the Land Clauses Consolidation Act to the compulsory taking of land for cultivation as well as for the making of roads, railways, canals, harbours, and other public objects, and the authorising of, not merely a joint stock company of "adventurers," but any one "adventurer," who wanted to reclaim a surface waste, to do what he may do in a mining waste of Cornwall or Derbyshire, go and mark out by metes and bounds so much of it as he may be reasonably considered competent to work and manage, register the "claim" in a land office of the locality, and invite the sheriff and a jury, or an arbitrator under the provisions of the above statute, to assess the value of the fee simple, and on payment thereof to have the same transferred to him and his heirs for ever, without further form or question. "Of the perfect competence of Parliament to direct some arrangement of this kind there can be no question. An authority which compels individuals to part with their most valued property on the slightest pretext of public convenience, and permits railway proprietors to throw down family mansions, and cut up favourite pleasure grounds, need not be very scrupulous about forcing a sale of boggy meadows or mountain pastures, in order to obtain the means of curing the destitution and misery of an entire people."*

Paley, who thinks that "the first rule of national policy requires" that the occupier should have "sufficient power over the soil for its perfect cultivation," and that "it is indifferent to the public in whose hands this power resides, if it be rightly used; it matters not to whom the land belongs if it be well cultivated," disapproves of "conditions of tenure, which condemn the land itself to perpetual sterility," and contends that an Act for abolishing such a state of things, "whilst it has in view the melioration of the soil, and tenders an equitable compensation for every right that it takes away, is neither more arbitrary nor more dangerous to the stability of pro-

* Thornton cited with Approbation in Mill, vol. i. p. 411.

perty than that which is done in the construction of roads, bridges, embankments, navigable canals, and, indeed, in almost every public work, in which private owners of property are obliged to accept that price for their property which an indifferent jury may award."†

We feel certain that such a measure as we have suggested would be amply sufficient, without any government aids or advances, and that under its operation the peasantry would buy up and reclaim the wastes, and recur to the practice, from which the earliest of our colonists derived the name of Firbolgs, and would soon restore our bogs and mountains to the fertility for which they were anciently celebrated. There may be many other modes of bringing these wastes into cultivation. We have confined ourselves to pointing out a few of the most effective. We do not dwell on the importance to the empire of keeping this island in the hands of a large population engaged in agriculture, as a nursery for soldiers to fight its battles, and a sort of market-garden, or outfarm, to supply its manufacturers with provisions. These, and a thousand other advantages of the suggestions which we have proposed, are obvious enough. We know too that the present Chief Secretary formerly entertained and avowed right opinions on this subject. The antecedents of the Lord Lieutenant would also lead one to think that he could not be indifferent respecting it. Still we can scarcely hope that their good intentions will not be thwarted by the mischievous jobbers, the *genii loci*, of the Castle, and that the unaccountable and wonderful folly which has marked the career of our masters from the beginning will not continue to mark it to the end of the chapter.

† Moral and Political Philosophy, p. 425.

ART. III.—1. *Evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons on Juvenile Crime.*

2. *Mettray.* A Lecture read before the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society, by ROBERT HALL, M.A., Recorder of Doncaster. W. and F. G. Cash.

3. *Letters of the Lord Abbot of St. Bernard's as to Establishment of a Reformatory School* Weekly Register.

GREAT Britain, riding on the crest of the wave of commercial prosperity, sees, at the same moment, immediately beneath her the yawning trough of deepest poverty and darkest crime. Extremes thus brought into startling proximity, are the result of excessive competition insufficiently regulated by charity or religion. The most wealthy is assuredly not the least criminal nation upon the earth. The eager reaching upwards in the social struggle impels many to tread upon their weaker neighbours, the very accumulations of some, strip and expose the bareness and nakedness of many others. Want neglected leads to crime. Crime punished when detected, but not cured or reformed, leads, in a wealthy community like ours, to the development of a hardened, astute, and organized band of criminals, who not only co-operate with each other and systematically live by violations of the law, but constantly keep alive the effective force of the body by training up and instructing a large proportion of the rising generation in the art and mystery of crime as a regular means of livelihood. No better illustration can be furnished of natural quickness combined with skilful, but perverted education, than Dickens's "Artful Dodger." Yet this is only a specimen of a class of youths whom old criminals take far more pains to instruct in crime than honest men take to instruct in virtue, and who consequently become diabolically wise in their evil generation. We have amongst us a numerous body of artful dodgers in various stages of existence, the chrysalis, the ugly grub, and the mischievous insect, coming rapidly on and constantly increasing. How is the increase of this evil to be arrested? If the accumulation of capital involve some concomitant evils, it supplies the means of doing everything remedial which can be done

by means of money. To some of our statesmen and political economists has, therefore, recently occurred the idea that some portion of our ample capital might be advantageously invested in the reformation of our young criminals. We must feed, and clothe, and keep them secure whilst punishing them. Is it possible at the same time to put them through a reformatory instead of a hardening process? The question is both interesting and important as a problem in political economy, making it a mere question of profit and loss in the national accounts. If it be susceptible of proof that it will cost no more to return into the world, in the shape of industrious and skilful workmen, instead of accomplished plunderers, some eighty or ninety per cent. of the young offenders committed to prison, then, we presume, there would be no objection to attempt the reform of young criminals even upon the same principle that we break in young horses or train any other useful animals.

Viewing the matter in this mere mercantile light, as a profit and loss account, society would incur the additional outlay of the longer period of detention and maintenance requisite for the reformatory process (which at Mettray in France amounts only to $4\frac{1}{2}$ d. per head per day) whilst on the other hand, presuming the instances of relapse to be as at Mettray, only eleven per cent., society would save the loss involved in the subsequent idleness, and subsequent depredations of eighty-nine out of every hundred young offenders under sixteen years of age once committed to prison, the subsequent cost of prosecuting and convicting them a second, third, or possibly a tenth time, or whatever may be the average number of recommittals after the first, the subsequent cost of maintaining these eighty-nine in each hundred in prison, during their second and subsequent periods of confinement, each in all probability exceeding the duration of the first, and the subsequent consequences of these eighty-nine in every hundred not only continuing bad themselves, but each of them, both in prison and out of prison, being actively employed in teaching many others to be adepts in crime, these pupils again in their turn, becoming apt instructors, so that the mischievous and costly consequences of every unreformed criminal, spread over and through, and darken, and vitiate society in an almost geometrical ratio. We cannot entertain a doubt that if a debtor and creditor account were

fairly drawn out, it would be clearly demonstrated that the pecuniary saving to society by every reformation of a criminal offender far exceeded the cost of the process of reform.

Of course it is not necessary for us to say, that if this economical result were not capable of demonstration, if even the reform of a young criminal were far more costly, it would still be the duty of the state to attempt it. This has not only been attempted, but accomplished, in various foreign countries and the publications referred to at the head of this article shew both the mode of operation and the practical results in various other countries.

Moved by one or both of the foregoing considerations, the British Parliament for the first time, in 1854, authorized the voluntary establishment of Reformatory Schools. It may be useful to our readers to state the exact purport of the provisions of the Legislature.

The act 17 and 18 Vic., c. 86 (1854) "for the better care and reformation of criminal offenders in Great Britain," after reciting that "Reformatory Schools for the better training of juvenile offenders have been and may be established by voluntary contributions in various parts of Great Britain, and that it is expedient that more extensive use should be made of such institutions," authorizes the Secretary of State for the Home Department, on application to him by the managers of any such Institution, to direct one of Her Majesty's inspectors of prisons to examine and report to him upon its condition and regulations, and any such institution as the Secretary of State shall certify to be useful and efficient for its purpose shall be held to be a Reformatory School under that act. Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools are authorized to visit from time to time any Reformatory Schools which has been so certified, and if, upon the report of any such Inspectors, the Home Secretary shall think proper to withdraw his certificate and notify such withdrawal to the managers, it shall then cease to be a Reformatory School under the act.

The second section authorizes magistrates, before whom persons under sixteen years of age shall be convicted and sentenced to any period of imprisonment beyond fourteen days, to direct, in addition to the punishment for the offence, that such offender be sent, at the expiration of his sentence, to some Reformatory School to be named in such direction, the managers of which shall be willing to receive

him, and to be there detained for not less than two nor more than five years, but the Home Secretary may at any time order any such person to be discharged from such school.

By section 3. Government is authorized to defray "out of any funds which shall be provided by parliament for that purpose," either the whole cost of the care and maintenance of any juvenile offender so detained in any Reformatory School, at such rate per head as shall be determined by them, or such portion thereof as government may think proper.

Authority is given to magistrates to commit to hard labour for any period not exceeding three months, any one who shall abscond, or wilfully neglect, or refuse to conform to the rules of any such Reformatory School. And the Home Secretary is authorized, if he think fit, to remove any such youthful offender from one Reformatory School to another.

In the following year, by 18 and 19 Vic., c. 87. (1855) magistrates are empowered, on the application of any person authorized by Government, to make an order on the parent or step-parent, if of sufficient ability, for the payment of any sum not exceeding five shillings a week for the maintenance of any offender so detained in any such Reformatory School, and this money is authorized to be levied by distraint, or, in default of goods, by commitment.

It will be observed that these Acts do not authorize Government to construct or to contribute towards the construction of a Reformatory School. Any person or body of persons who may be so benevolently disposed, are at liberty to construct and equip such a school. All that Government does is, in the first place, to certify it as adapted for its ostensible purpose. This certificate Government may, in the exercise of its discretion, and judging of course from the reports of its inspectors, at any time withdraw. Magistrates may order young criminals, after the expiration of their period of punishment, to be detained in *any* such certified school, but the Home Secretary may at any time order the removal of an inmate from one school to another. Government may, if parliament provide the means, defray the whole or any part of the cost of maintenance and training of the inmates in such Reformatory Schools.

Considering the operation of the Act as it affects us

Catholics, it may become 'a great good or a great evil *according to the mode of its administration*. The letter of the Act gives committing magistrates the power of directing Catholic children to be detained in Protestant schools, and it gives the Home Secretary the power of either confirming or remedying this injustice.

Assume that magistrates carry out the act fairly, and direct the detention in Catholic schools of all children who have either Catholic parents, or guardians, or who are known to have had Catholic parents, or even if the Home Secretary readily and promptly remedy any instance of magisterial injustice or neglect, and take means to prevent its repetition, then we can recognize the great practical value of the measure. It may, indeed, with much appearance of reason, be contended that the discretionary power of doing right involves the possible power of doing wrong, which should not be vested in any one, either magistrate or Home Secretary, and that the act should give express direction for the children of Catholic parents to be sent to a Catholic Reformatory School. We are far from denying that the Act is in this respect susceptible of improvement, but at the same time we know by experience that the operation and results of an act of parliament depend far more upon the spirit in which it is administered than upon its mere letter. We trust that by the magistrates of England, as a body, it will be fairly and properly administered, and if any instances should occur of over-zealous justices adding to the punishment of a Catholic youthful offender, by endeavouring to make a Protestant of him, the Home Secretary has an appellate jurisdiction which we presume must have been given to him for the purpose of enabling him to do right in such possible cases, and we only hope that he will make the mode of appeal to Government more simple and easy, and the decision of Government more prompt than has hitherto been too often the custom when the supreme Government has to remedy the errors of inferior tribunals.

On the assumption, then, that this Act be justly administered, it offers to Catholics a fair opportunity, if they only exert themselves to use it, of securing the return to virtue of those young members of our Church who may unfortunately have fallen into evil courses. A blessed opportunity this, which those amongst us who have the means will surely not allow to be lost. The provisions of

the Act moreover make this no such overwhelming tax upon us, but on the contrary offer so many inducements and so much aid towards this work of charity, as to increase the weight of our responsibility, we had almost said of our guilt, if we, the Catholics of England, in future allow any poor young erring member of our body to remain unreclaimed, and instead of the kind and melting influences of reformatory discipline, to become yet more hardened in vice, to the injury of society and the scandal of our religion. This Act of Parliament for the first time holds out the prospect of Government aid being given towards education *in proportion to real need*, and not as at present, in proportion only to the amount of private contributions, by the application of which latter erroneous principle much obtains more, while those who have little to give can get little or nothing given.

In this case, upon the assumption we have mentioned, the very principle for which we contended in our former article upon Lord John Russell's and Sir John Pakington's Education Bills, has been adopted. Let private zeal and charity build, establish, and equip a Reformatory School, so that, after inspection by one of the Inspectors of Prisons, it can obtain the certificate of the Home Secretary, that it is adapted for its purpose, and let it afterwards be so conducted as not to lose this certificate, and then government will pay a certain weekly sum per head for all the inmates of such an establishment, which sum we trust will be nearly, if not quite equivalent, to the actual costs of maintenance, according to some reasonably low but approved scale. Here government proffer to do precisely what we asked them to do with the general education grant, and we trust that means may yet be found of distributing the latter fund according to the same equitable principle. If this were done we believe it would be found to be the only practicable, and at the same time, the most efficacious mode of solving the difficult problem of imparting, in our mixed religious state of society in this country, a good religious education to all by the means of government aid, without unfair neglect of, or undue partiality towards any. Here, however, in this Reformatory School Act, we have the boon offered to us. Shall we with anything like corresponding zeal avail ourselves of it? We have but to purchase the lands, construct the schools, and establish in them suitable instructors, and

then we have reason to believe that government will provide the maintenance of the inmates. And well indeed, and with most prudent economy and sensible foresight may it do so, in order to have young offenders returned into society reformed characters, to add to its strength and welfare, instead of hardened criminals to plunder and prey upon its resources, and vitiate its physical and moral composition. With such inducements shall we Catholics fail to do that comparatively small share of the work which remains for us to accomplish? It is not merely a duty, but a *retributive* duty, for how many of these poor Catholic children would have been saved from prison, if hitherto we had performed our full duty of providing the means of good religious education for all? If a poor child, born and bred in the midst of poverty, and wretchedness, and filth, and too often, alas, of vice also, uninstructed, or ill-instructed in religion, not taught any habits of industry, or order, or cleanliness,—not skilled in any employment by which to acquire a decent regular livelihood, having little or no incentive or encouragement, either within it or around it, to virtue or good behaviour, what wonder if such a poor neglected child commit some petty depredation as apparently its only means of subsistence! And for this first offence, and all its consequences in the career of crime, who is most responsible before the Almighty? The poor untaught almost helpless child, or its more wealthy neighbours, who *ought* to have provided for every such child a school, where it might have been taught its religion, its duties in life, and how to fulfil them, where its disposition and character might have been kindly inclined towards good behaviour, and where, if it did not acquire some useful art, by which to maintain itself in after life, it might at least have been made apt to learn and accustomed to obey, and might have entered upon the struggle of life with well formed habits of order, docility, industry, honesty, cleanliness, and truthfulness. If all Catholic children had began to work their difficult way through the world in this country, fortified with a sound religious education, how large a deduction would there have been made from the number of Catholic youths now unfortunately included in the class of juvenile offenders. If, then, we have by our neglect in any degree passively contributed to the increase of crime, it only remains for us now to offer the best atonement in our power, 1st. by

providing that in future every Catholic child shall, in its tender and innocent years, when it is most susceptible of virtuous impressions, have its character formed and strengthened by a sound religious education, ere it encounter the trials and temptations of life; and 2nd. that all Catholic children who, whether from ignorance or want, or vicious propensity, or any other cause, have become criminal, shall have every inducement, opportunity, and encouragement, by which evil habits may be changed, evil companions forgotten, lessons of virtue and industry learnt, and a new character acquired in a Catholic Reformatory School, under the care of a religious community, devoted to the arduous but most blessed work of melting the hearts of sinners to repentance, and by care and kindness, gradually moulding them to virtue, and leading them into habits of good conduct.

This is a work of charity which, by Catholics, or rather we should strictly say, by the religious orders amongst Catholics, may be fulfilled in a manner and with a success which may form a distinguishing mark of our holy religion. These pious, humble, but heroic men can, we may venture to say, do more than any Protestant community, with all its wealth, and all its intelligence, and all its array of physical means can do, towards the reformation of juvenile offenders,—it is the peculiar business to which they have devoted themselves, and the grace of God works with them. We have, then, a special duty before us; government offers us aid in performing it—we have peculiar means of fulfilling it satisfactorily,—comparatively little is left for us to do, and the full and effective fulfilment of this duty will not only reclaim many youths of Catholic origin, who have been both a disgrace to our religion and a pest to society, but will, at the same time, tend to place the Catholic religion, and especially its religious orders, in their true and beneficent light, before the Protestant public of this kingdom. Works of charity earnestly and disinterestedly performed, are much more eloquent to turn the hearts not only of their objects, but of their observers, than any other form of eloquence, whether addressed to the heart or the intellect. If, as the good Abbot of St. Bernard's observes in his letter to the *Weekly Register*, the contemplative be more efficacious than the charitable mode of conversion, the argumentative mode is surely inferior to both. Will, then, the Catholics

of England subscribe sufficient money to place suitable roofs over the good brothers who undertake to reform the juvenile offenders amongst us? We rejoice to say that there appear to be some indications of a resolution to fulfil this necessary part of our duty, and we trust that no one who possesses the means will delay an instant in forwarding his appropriate contribution towards this urgent work of charity, bearing in mind also, that at the present moment, *donations* are mainly required to complete the buildings, as there seems a reasonable prospect of a considerable portion of the current expense of maintaining the inmates being in future years borne by the government.

Already one Reformatory School, at Brook Green, near London, has been built by the subscriptions of, we regret to say, only a few benevolent Catholics, it has been inspected by Her Majesty's Inspector, and has been duly certificated by the Home Secretary, and we presume, therefore, is now to receive and commence the reformation of young offenders, who may be ordered to be detained in it. It is under the care of four Brothers of the Order of Les Freres de Notre Dame de la Misericorde, instituted by Canon Scheppers, of Malines.

A meeting has been held, resolutions passed, and a subscription commenced towards the establishment of a similar institution in Yorkshire, which may probably provide for the criminal offenders of the North-Eastern District of England. Lancashire is also arousing itself, and will doubtless in its usual prompt and business-like fashion, soon have a similar establishment completed, and in operation in that populous and Catholic county, which might for the present suffice for the whole North-Western District. The appeals of the earnest and benevolent Abbot of St. Bernard's cannot but be speedily responded to by the Catholics of the Midland Counties, from which district of country all Catholic juvenile offenders might be very suitably received in a Reformatory School planted in the midst of Charwood Forest. And if another Catholic Reformatory School were undertaken in the South-Western District, and possibly also one in Wales, the Catholics in England would then, for the present at least, have prepared the means of receiving and attempting the reform of all the Catholic *boys* under

sixteen years of age, who may in this country be committed to prison for criminal offences.

But the Act of Parliament extends also to *girls*, and we are not aware that at present there either exists, or is any prospect of a single establishment in this country, in which a poor girl under sixteen years of age, the child of Catholic parents, who may have been sent to prison, can, after emerging from such imprisonment, be received, reclaimed, taught, trained, and inclined to become virtuous, honest, and industrious. We confidently ask the Catholic ladies of England whether they will allow us to repeat such an observation twelve months hence? What, as things are at present, is to become of the poor young girl who has been once sent to prison? What can she do? What honest employment is open to her? She cannot produce a satisfactory "character from her last place," for that was the prison. Perhaps under the pressure of want she may have been committed for some petty larceny, and after the suffering of a prison, if she have only escaped contamination there, feels inclined towards a better course of life, could she only obtain in an honest manner the means of livelihood, yet, what in the generality of cases under existing circumstances will she do, but fall from bad to worse, and become, it is but too likely, an utterly abandoned character?

True it is that the number of young girls is far less than that of boys committed to prison, but the only conclusion we should draw from this fact would be, that a less number of Reformatory Schools would suffice for their reception, and consequently a less amount of money be required to establish them. Two, or at most three,—one southward, one northward, and one in the central part of the kingdom, would probably suffice for the present. Girls, we conceive, would be quite as favourable subjects for reformatory discipline as boys, whilst some of our conventual establishments can supply us with a peculiarly qualified class of managers for Reformatory Schools for girls. How much good might be done, not only to the young girls themselves, but to our religion generally, by the visible results of a few Reformatory Schools for girls, in active operation, under the superintendence of nuns in this country! There exists one establishment in London, of the order of the Good Shepherd, as a place of refuge, a home, and a reformatory school, if we may so term it, for

repentant females ; we know not whether their rules would admit of their undertaking the conduct of a Reformatory School under this act of parliament ; but, however that may be, we feel that the attempt to combine both subjects of reform under the same roof, might be open to objection ; for though occasionally identical in character, they would often be widely dissimilar ; and whilst hardly any one would wish the two classes, even though reforming or reformed, to be associated together, government would probably, and might reasonably object to their both being included in the same establishment. The great aim, however, of any such Reformatory Schools for girls would be, as we believe it is that of the present Convent of the Good Shepherd, not only to teach the girls their religion, and incline them to virtue, but also to employ them, and make them skilful in some occupation, by which they can honestly gain their livelihood when they leave the establishment ; and then, if they deserve it, to give them a good character, and secure them respectable places, so that, on their re-entrance into the world, they may start fair, and be free from those temptations and difficulties which beset, and usually overwhelm the poor girls who have once fallen.

Two amendments in the Reformatory School Act seem extremely desirable. All the witnesses agree that most of our English prisons are peculiarly adapted to convert juvenile offenders into callous criminals, and the act now requires that every juvenile offender shall go through this hardening process for at least a fortnight, in a prison, before he is sent to a Reformatory School. We really cannot see the necessity for thus undertaking to perfect a boy's education in crime before we attempt to reform him, and would suggest the expediency of magistrates being authorized on conviction for certain minor offences, to remit the imprisonment altogether, and send the children direct to Reformatory Schools.

The authorized period of detention in a Reformatory School is also, we think, susceptible of improvement. In France they are detained till twenty years of age, which strikes us as being better than sending them back into the world at an earlier period. At twenty a reformed youth, having learnt some mode of honest livelihood, will have a stronger feeling of self reliance, and be less likely to return to his former haunts, to be influenced by his former

vicious companions, or to relapse into his former evil habits. He got wrong as a boy, he starts fresh as a man. We trust, therefore, to see the act amended in the foregoing respects.

On the subject of the kind of labour in which the inmates of Reformatory Schools should be employed, the Abbot of St. Bernard's speaks strongly, and with as much truth as force, of the value of agriculture as a mode of employment in these institutions. He says:—"Of the various kinds of manual labour, agriculture is the best for a Reformatory," and adds his reasons for this opinion. The opinion, however, requires some qualification. If the subjects of reform were like the good monks, to continue *during life* in the establishment, the opinion might then perhaps be absolutely and universally true, because, *whilst there*, no employment could be better for them than agriculture. But the Reformatory School is a place of *preparation for a return of its inmates into the world*, where they have relatives and friends, and various local associations and connections, which will lead them usually to revisit the locality where they have been born and bred. They from the country will generally go back to the country, they from the town will most frequently re-enter the town.

The test, then, of the most fit mode of employment in a Reformatory School, is, not merely its aptitude within the institution, but also its utility on re-entrance into the world, in enabling each youth to maintain himself independently in that locality to which he naturally resorts. Mr. Hall informs us that at Mettray, "the general rule is, that the employment shall be either agricultural, or directly ancillary to agriculture;" yet, there "the children are assigned to each particular employment, according to their respective turns and capacities, *some regard being also had to the employments* in which their parents and immediate connections are engaged; thus, a large proportion of the children from Paris are put to tailoring and washing, those being employments in which they are likely to find work amongst their immediate friends, if they return to them; tailoring is to some extent treated exceptionally, in this respect, that all the young *détenus*, without exception, are put to it for a certain time; it is thought desirable to enable every one among them to keep his own clothes in decent repair, the keeping up of decency

in costume being at all events one step towards the preservation of self-respect." And elsewhere he says: "All the clothes worn in the establishment are made there." And again, "many of the colonists come from the seaports, and are not only the children of sailors, but have themselves received the usual early initiation into the ways and workings of a seaman's life. Now, if these children are to be good for anything, they are to be made good sailors. A piece of ground, shaped like the horizontal section of a ship, is partitioned off with bulwarks, and fitted up with masts, sails, and rigging, like a vessel of considerable tonnage, and the young sailors are exercised every day by an experienced boatswain, in the various manipulations of the sails, yards, and ropes." We only quote these as instances of what we would wish to recommend, that the manual labour in the reformatory school should, according to the circumstances of each inmate, be such as would be most likely to be useful to him after he leaves it.

But notwithstanding all we have endeavoured to say in favour of the prompt and adequate establishment of Catholic Reformatory Schools, we must still acknowledge that innocence is better than repentance; that it is easier to train an innocent child in the way in which it should walk, than to bring back the wanderer who has deviated from the proper course; that the same means applied to train innocent children to godliness, will yield many more good men and women than if applied to the training of juvenile offenders; and that therefore, with our limited means, it would be very perverse and distorted economy to establish only complete Reformatory Schools, whilst we leave *any* of our young untainted Catholic children without the opportunity of obtaining sound religious instruction. A good elementary school attached to each mission, with a competent master and mistress, (of a religious order if possible, or next with certified teachers if they can be had,) is the best, i.e., the most easy, most economical, and most effectual Reformatory School. And now that government is prepared to do so much towards the building of such elementary schools, and towards the support of pupil teachers and certified teachers in them, there is little excuse for any Catholic congregation being without such a school for the instruction of all the poor Catholic children of the neighbourhood. Whatever can be said in behalf of Reformatory Schools may *a fortiori* be urged in behalf of these

elementary schools ; and we trust, therefore, that the rising zeal for the one will not lead to any diminished exertion for the other. We would presume to suggest to every individual Catholic the reflection whether there be in his own neighbourhood any one poor Catholic child without a school to which he can resort, to learn his religion and all his duties in life ; and if it occur to him that there is one such, that it becomes his duty at once to set to work to do his own utmost, and to co-operate with others, in establishing a school there. It will be far indeed from any credit to us Catholics if, after founding and maintaining for a few years our Reformatory Schools, their statistics prove that we have an undue or even a large number of criminals, whom indeed we train and reform in a very excellent manner, a large proportion of whom come out thoroughly reformed, but whose places are constantly filled by an equally large supply of fresh inmates. Such a result as this would immediately be pointed at by our Protestant neighbours as a proof of the inferior morality of the Catholic religion, whilst in truth it would only be a proof of our inferior means and our inferior zeal.

We must have adequate Reformatory Schools, because, even when the utmost possible efforts have been made to train the infant mind to virtue, bad example, bad companions, the cravings of want, or the temptations of vice, some, or one of these, or of the many other snares which surround youth, will lead some into the commission of crime.

Whilst, therefore, Reformatory Schools are a necessity, and whilst we seek to establish and maintain them in the best possible order, our primary and most essential duty is to keep them *as empty* as possible. Let us, therefore, endeavour to *reform*, but let us still more endeavour to *prevent* vice. Even those who may lapse into vicious courses are more likely subjects for reformatory discipline, if the hour of meditation in prison can carry back their thoughts to the good instruction which they imbibed in years of innocence, and which in those moments will again exert its wholesome influence over them.

The religious educational orders in the Catholic Church are also peculiarly calculated to lead others properly to esteem our faith from the good fruits which it yields in this particular branch of charity. But we are lamentably deficient in the pecuniary means. We have a nobility and gentry, some of whom give liberally towards the education of the poor ;

we have a very numerous poor needing aid in order to their education ; but we are weak in that middle element which forms the sinewy strength and motive power of every social body ; the mercantile, professional, manufacturing and trading classes. We venture to say that, circumstanced as we are in this country, it is education alone which can greatly enlarge our pecuniary means of promoting education. Who form the middle class of England, the industrious, energetic, honest and successful men in every branch of trade ? Generally speaking, the sons or grandsons of working men. It seldom happens in the manufacturing towns that any established business is continued for three generations in the same lineal line. The better taught, more industrious, and most energetic sons of the hard, but skilful-handed artizans are constantly rising to fill up the vacant places in the busy and thriving middle class. Why not more Catholics thus rise into more lucrative positions ? Cultivated intelligence, persevering activity, and tried integrity are the usual requisites for the achievement. Why are so many of them still mere hewers of wood and drawers of water, engaged in the most laborious but least skilled and least profitable employments ? Something is no doubt owing to the prejudices of Protestant employers. But the more qualified the man the less need he fear prejudice. Skill is sought by the employer instead of having to seek employment. Our Catholic poor have great natural intelligence, industry and energy which are often astonishing ; and aptitude both physical and mental, to become successful and even distinguished in any occupation. The conscientiousness of the Catholic forms also a more than average qualification for positions of trust and confidence. We would wish to see the skilled Catholic artizan and the superior Catholic accountant and clerk triumph over prejudice, and *command* employment by making it *the interest* of every Protestant employer to engage him, and more Catholics also by dint of superior acquirements become employers themselves. Education is one of the means by which this improvement in position is to be effected. We are comparatively deficient in the pecuniary means ; let us endeavour to make up for it by more zeal, by greater self-sacrifices, by more earnest individual exertions, and more cordial and general co-operation, by every one who is above receiving assistance himself, subscribing something towards the school of

his own locality, and the members of every congregation sending up regularly an appropriate contribution to the funds of the Catholic poor school committee. We claim to have a more pure religion, should it not show itself in more perfect charity? in our charitable subscriptions and our charitable zeal being greater in proportion to our means than those of our Protestant neighbours? We wish we could truly say that we were so distinguished; and we trust, yet to see the day when such a distinction may with truth be attributed to us. Schools, such as we have mentioned, in every congregation, well cared for and well conducted, would not only make good Catholics and good and useful members of society, and leave comparatively few inmates for the workhouse, and still fewer for Catholic Reformatory Schools; but would also tend to qualify all to earn good wages, and many to rise into superior, more confidential, and more lucrative employments; would promote, in fact, the formation of an intelligent, active, honest, thriving, and gradually increasing Catholic middle class, who would be both able and willing to swell the amount of support to those schools to which they had been themselves indebted for their early instruction. These schools, therefore, besides being a blessing to both their scholars and their founders, and most effectually sustaining and diffusing the light of our faith, would also reproduce their own best supporters, and be maintained in increasing efficiency by the increasing means of their own offspring.

The topic of Catholic Reformatory Schools for juvenile offenders has necessarily led us to that of schools for all poor Catholic children. We trust that no one will think that a subscription to the former can make an increased subscription to the latter needless; if the former are necessary, and assuredly they are so, the latter are, if possible, still more necessary; if the former can do good, the latter can do still more good; the former can never supply the place of, and hardly even diminish the occasion for the latter; whilst the latter, if increased in number and well supported, can and will lessen the extent of evil qualification for the former. As a Catholic organization has commenced for the establishment and maintenance of Reformatory Schools in various counties or districts of the kingdom, why may not this organization be made applicable also to the establishment, and more effectual maintenance of primary Catholic schools in the same localities,

we have a very numerous poor needing aid in order to their education ; but we are weak in that middle element which forms the sinewy strength and motive power of every social body ; the mercantile, professional, manufacturing and trading classes. We venture to say that, circumstanced as we are in this country, it is education alone which can greatly enlarge our pecuniary means of promoting education. Who form the middle class of England, the industrious, energetic, honest and successful men in every branch of trade ? Generally speaking, the sons or grandsons of working men. It seldom happens in the manufacturing towns that any established business is continued for three generations in the same lineal line. The better taught, more industrious, and most energetic sons of the hard, but skilful-handed artizans are constantly rising to fill up the vacant places in the busy and thriving middle class. Why not more Catholics thus rise into more lucrative positions ? Cultivated intelligence, persevering activity, and tried integrity are the usual requisites for the achievement. Why are so many of them still mere hewers of wood and drawers of water, engaged in the most laborious but least skilled and least profitable employments ? Something is no doubt owing to the prejudices of Protestant employers. But the more qualified the man the less need he fear prejudice. Skill is sought by the employer instead of having to seek employment. Our Catholic poor have great natural intelligence, industry and energy which are often astonishing ; and aptitude both physical and mental, to become successful and even distinguished in any occupation. The conscientiousness of the Catholic forms also a more than average qualification for positions of trust and confidence. We would wish to see the skilled Catholic artizan and the superior Catholic accountant and clerk triumph over prejudice, and ~~command~~ employment by making it *the interest* of every Protestant employer to engage him, and more Catholics also by dint of superior acquirements become employers themselves. Education is one of the means by which this improvement in position is to be effected. We are comparatively deficient in the pecuniary means ; let us endeavour to make up for it by more zeal, by greater self-sacrifices, by more earnest individual exertions, and more cordial and general co-operation, by every one who is above receiving assistance himself, subscribing something towards the school of

his own locality, and the members of every congregation sending up regularly an appropriate contribution to the funds of the Catholic poor school committee. We claim to have a more pure religion, should it not show itself in more perfect charity? in our charitable subscriptions and our charitable zeal being greater in proportion to our means than those of our Protestant neighbours? We wish we could truly say that we were so distinguished; and we trust, yet to see the day when such a distinction may with truth be attributed to us. Schools, such as we have mentioned, in every congregation, well cared for and well conducted, would not only make good Catholics and good and useful members of society, and leave comparatively few inmates for the workhouse, and still fewer for Catholic Reformatory Schools; but would also tend to qualify all to earn good wages, and many to rise into superior, more confidential, and more lucrative employments; would promote, in fact, the formation of an intelligent, active, honest, thriving, and gradually increasing Catholic middle class, who would be both able and willing to swell the amount of support to those schools to which they had been themselves indebted for their early instruction. These schools, therefore, besides being a blessing to both their scholars and their founders, and most effectually sustaining and diffusing the light of our faith, would also reproduce their own best supporters, and be maintained in increasing efficiency by the increasing means of their own offspring.

The topic of Catholic Reformatory Schools for juvenile offenders has necessarily led us to that of schools for all poor Catholic children. We trust that no one will think that a subscription to the former can make an increased subscription to the latter needless; if the former are necessary, and assuredly they are so, the latter are, if possible, still more necessary; if the former can do good, the latter can do still more good; the former can never supply the place of, and hardly even diminish the occasion for the latter; whilst the latter, if increased in number and well supported, can and will lessen the extent of evil qualification for the former. As a Catholic organization has commenced for the establishment and maintenance of Reformatory Schools in various counties or districts of the kingdom, why may not this organization be made applicable also to the establishment, and more effectual maintenance of primary Catholic schools in the same localities,

the objects, resources, and principles of management being in both alike, if not identical; and when some half score gentlemen are brought twenty or fifty miles from their several homes to a central point of meeting, there would be obvious convenience and economy in getting as large an amount of consultative work out of them as possible; we would beg, therefore, with due deference, to suggest whether the Catholic Poor School Committee in London, and the recently appointed committees for the establishment of Reformatory Schools in various parts of the country might not easily and advantageously be brought into correspondence and co-operation with each other.

-
- ART. IV.—1. *The History of England*. By JOHN LINGARD, D. D. Fifth Edition. (vol. iii.) 10 vols. 8vo. London. Dolman, 1849.*
 2. *Foss' Judges of England*, vols. iii. and iv. London: Longmans.

ENGLISHMEN regard with pride the age of Edward III., but it is a pride which is usually misinformed. There is in it a confused idea of conquest, which, in fact,

* It is unnecessary to repeat our eulogies upon this great work; or upon this extremely cheap and useful edition of it. Neither is it necessary to make any apology for supplying occasionally some matter of confirmation or illustration (we can scarcely ever say correction) in addition to those stores of learning by which it is enriched. Suffice it to say that the great author by no means made it part of his plan to state the Catholic case as strongly as he could, but quite the reverse; he endeavoured to state it as moderately as possible, always in that respect taking care to understate the truth. To supply occasional omissions of such an historian cannot derogate from his merit, but may rather enhance his impartiality. No error on the other side has ever been proved against Lingard. An attempt has recently been made to do so by a contemporary (we allude to an article in the *New Quarterly*) but it is really so frivolous as to require no further notice.

is founded only upon temporary military glory, concealing the reality of ultimate failure and discomfiture ; and while Catholics forget that in this age were sown the seeds of that fatal religious revolution, which is called the Reformation, Protestants do not reflect that, if the tyranny of the Plantagenets was got rid of, as regards the temporality—and that too only by the aid of the Church—it was rivetted on the nation as regards the spirituality, (if a State Church can be said to have any spirituality,) by the gradual establishment of the Royal Supremacy. And although it was that supremacy, against which Saxon saints had ever striven, and which Saxon sovereigns had never successfully asserted, and which it was reserved for Norman conquerors, by the stern power of the sword, to impose upon the nation ; yet, with strange and shallow inconsistency, historical eulogists of Saxon freedom and of Saxon times, are found to be supporters of that very Royal Supremacy, which was the worst fruit of the Norman Conquest, and the great badge of Norman slavery.

There is a confused idea abroad that civil liberty, literature, and civilization, arose in Edward's age, and that they found their origin in consequence of the rising disaffection to what then began to be called the " Court " of Rome, i. e. the Holy See. In short, the notion is, that they arose rather in spite of the Holy See,—that literature and liberty were powers antagonistic to the Church ;—or the objects, if not of her opposition, of her aversion and her jealousy. It is necessary that the enemies of the Church should resort to this theory, in order to reconcile with the literary or military glory, and the rising liberty of this age, their favourite idea, that the Catholic religion " enslaves the intellect and degrades the soul," and that the Church has been one of the obstructions to moral and intellectual progress. For the plain fact is, that England never won so much military glory, (whatever it is worth,) as in the age of our Edwards ; and that the foundations of our liberties were laid deep and strong in the charters of that age ; and that the seeds of that literature, which, in the age of Elizabeth, under men born and bred under Catholic influences, reached such splendid (though corrupted) fruition—such a wealth of verdure, with such a growth, of weeds—were sown in that same age. And it does so happen that the germs of every kind of knowledge were planted; the seeds of every science and of every art

of which we now enjoy the development were sown; the beginnings of every useful invention, of which the age of progress is so proud, were made in Catholic countries, and in Catholic times. As to literature and art, we need scarcely say, that they not only have never risen higher, but have never risen so high as in the age of Edward III. No one will say that, if Shakspeare and Milton *surpassed* in poetic power the old English poet, Chaucer, they would have done so, had their precursors never written; nor, if our great epic equals that of Dante, will it be forgotten that from Italian poetry ours took its inspiration; while, as to art, unless we can except Gothic architecture, we literally had *none*. The truth is, however, that the glories of gothic architecture came from abroad; and if we had any native architects who worked them, they were encouraged by the ecclesiastics, to whose taste and talent, not less than their bounty and liberality, we owe the erection of those noble fanes, which form the chief glory of every city in the country. It ought to abate the spirit of English pride, and the bitterness of English prejudice, to remember that our literature had its inspiration (as our religion had its immediate derivation) from Popish Italy; and that Italian art we have hardly had taste enough to admire, and have never been able even to imitate. The thirteenth century was marked in Italy by the revival of art, in the painting of Cimabue; it was marked in England by the birth of our first discoverer in useful art or natural philosophy; and he was a *friar*. The discoveries of Roger Bacon, a monk, are all we have to record in that century, which witnessed, in Italy, the fruits of the genius of Dante and Cimabue. And the first half of the next century, illumined in Italy by the triumph of Petrarch, had elapsed, ere the first English poets had been born. Our earliest achievements were not poetical, but commercial. The same age witnessed our first commercial treaty, our first navigation laws, our first woollen and linen manufactures, and the use of bills of exchange, those engines of trade,—and bombs, those engines of war. Even in this utilitarian line we had rarely the merit of invention,—neither bills of exchange nor bombs were *first* used in England,—gold had been coined abroad twenty years before it was coined here,—our weaving came from Flanders,—our poetry from Italy,—our silk from Sicily,—glass was not made in England until the fifteenth century,—

spectacles were invented by an Italian monk,—our banking system came from Venice,—the mariner's compass was discovered at Naples,—neither paper nor printing were *invented* in England,—our whole commercial system arose in Italy, and the name of "Italian book-keeping" to this day testifies to its origin. In the 12th and 13th centuries, (says Tytler,) "the Italians were the only commercial people in Europe." He adds, "Venice set the example of a national bank, in 1157," and "in the Middle Age the Italian merchants were the factors of all European nations, and the Lombards *awakened* the spirit of commerce, and *gave birth* to manufactures." So that, even in our own peculiar fields, those of commerce and manufactures, we were but followers and imitators of Italians. What on earth have we to be proud of, or what reason is there for the silly scorn with which so many of our nation affect to look down on Italy, Spain, or Portugal? All these countries long preceded us in the march of civilization, literature, liberty, and art. And we, in common with them, derived all from the enlightening influence of the Church. The English idea that all this was in *spite* of the Church, is an imbecile and ignorant delusion. It was in *consequence* of the influence of the Church, that civil liberty, literature, and art, arose; they flourished under the fostering care of the Church; they reached their earliest and loftiest heights in countries most under the influence of the Church. Long before the Reformation, the Germans had invented printing, Spain had discovered America, and the Portuguese had settled in India; and long before the age of Edward III., Italy had risen, under the influence of Rome, to a height of glory, whence she shed light and heat—the light of truth, and the heat of genius—over all the nations of Europe.

The popular idea of the age of our Edwards is, that as it was an age in which our national greatness began, and in which the spirit of nationality led to an impatience of the authority of the Holy See; so the rise of our national greatness was the *result* of this same spirit. Moreover, there is an idea that the spirit of nationality was the spirit of energy and enlightenment,—that there was a divorce between faith and freedom;—that the religion was a religion of darkness, and unfavourable either to light, to liberty, or to literature; and that, in proportion

to the national disposition to rebellion against Rome, was its emancipation from ignorance, and its advance towards liberty and civilization. The very reverse of all this is (we repeat) the plain historical truth. The power, friendly to liberty, and favourable to literature and civilization in that age, was the Church, and pre-eminently the Holy See. Civilization proceeded from that sacred seat of faith, as from a common centre. All other powers were powers of spoliation, barbarism, pillage, and rapine.

The Church was ever the protector of the oppressed—the teacher of the ignorant. The opposition to her arose on the part of those who were the oppressors, not the oppressed. Tyrannical princes found her interfering between them and their victims; and while they were jealous of her influence, they were covetous of her domains. The *people* knew the Church to be their patron, their protector, and their friend. The tenantry of the Church were the happiest and the most prosperous, and it was a common maxim in that age, that “it was better to live under the crozier than under the lance.” Liberty ever found in the Church a champion; and learning was fostered in the cloisters she sheltered, and diffused in the schools she founded. The jealousy of her power, and the envy of her property, which arose in this age, arose only among proud and rapacious princes, and their sensual and rapacious retainers, who had no regard for learning, and whose yearnings were after pillage. The secret of their conduct towards the Church was always the same,—it was simply covetousness. All this we shall show.

The real glory of the age of our first Edwards, was the glory of the Church; and in the first place, hers was most emphatically the glory of rising *liberty*. In a former article we showed that St. Thomas of Canterbury, under Henry II., offered the first resistance to the indefinite exactions and unlicensed extortions of the Crown, and perhaps might be said to have laid down the principle of controlling the power of taxation by representative constitution. In the reigns of Henry III. and John, the Church was the power most zealous in asserting the liberties of the people; and the names of cardinals, and primates, and legates, stand foremost among those attached to the great Charters, as having gained them, and guaranteed them. We cannot, therefore, concur in two opinions of Dr. Lin-

gard, that the clergy confined their attention to the concerns of the Church,* and that "the knights and burgesses in every contest with the Crown, bore the brunt of the battle, and it was to their courage and perseverance that the people of England owed the greater part of their liberties."† On the contrary, they and the barons always made the Church "bear the brunt of every contest with the Crown" until their secular liberties were won, and then, basely indifferent to spiritual freedom, they betrayed the liberties of the Church, by whose aid they had won their own. Naturally enough the crown was jealous of the papacy; and modern writers absurdly enough ascribe this jealousy to a zeal for national independence, as they attribute the jealousy of the barons and burgesses to zeal for national liberty. The truth is, that the sovereigns were jealous of the Holy See, simply because it was inimical to their tyranny; and the barons and burgesses were jealous merely upon matters of money. No instances can be adduced of their resistance, either to the Crown or the Church, save on some such sordid ground. And the worst, or most tyrannical monarchs were exactly those who were most jealous of the Papacy.

We repeat, the real glory of the rise of liberty in this realm belongs to the Church, the Catholic Church, under the presidency of St. Peter's successors.

From the time of Henry III. every charter was won for the nation mainly by the Church. Thus that of John, obtained and dictated by the barons, in defence of the laws and statutes of the realm, commences thus:—

"By the counsel of Stephen, Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England, and Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church; and of Master Randolph, our lord the Pope's sub-deacon and familiar, etc., it is granted that the English Church (*Anglicana Ecclesia*) shall be free and have her whole rights and liberties inviolable, and that freedom of election which was ever reputed most requisite for the English Church."

What these rights and liberties, and this freedom of election, meant as against the king, is clear from the history of the previous reigns, as shown in our former article, on the contests of St. Anselm and St. Thomas. It was only the sovereign, not the Holy See, who had ever

* Vol. iii. p. 111.

† p. 109.

interfered with that freedom, or those rights. It was the Sovereign who had sought to injure the Church in England, by keeping sees vacant, or filling them up with his creatures, or plundering them when filled. It was the Holy See which had been struggling with sordid Sovereigns, and supporting such prelates as St. Anselm and St. Thomas against them.

In a former article we remarked on the veneration and affection with which the English nation had regarded the laws of Edward the Confessor, of which the relics only were rescued in the Great Charter. What those laws were, Protestant writers profess to be unable to discover, and Catholic writers do not always seem to have enquired. Yet they are to be seen in the Saxon Laws, which are the authorities Coke pronounced to have been the basis of our common law. It is obvious that a knowledge of them is essential to a due understanding of the contests between the secular and the spiritual powers under the Norman sovereigns. It was the essence of the Saxon constitution, that all offences were originally and primarily of spiritual cognizance, and that the temporal power was only to be called in by the Church to aid her in enforcing her authority. It was the object, on the contrary, of the Norman sovereigns to make the crown the source of all jurisdiction, and that of the Church only subsidiary and subservient. The reason of this was not merely that the discipline of the Church was too merciful for the savage spirit of tyranny—but that its jurisdiction interfered with the spirit of rapacity. To sovereigns whose title was conquest, whose object was spoliation, and who made no scruple of sacrilege, the sentences of the Church were of course obnoxious; and the power of excommunication they regarded with jealousy and animosity. Therefore, the Conqueror was no sooner seated on the throne than he sought to fetter the Church in the exercise of this power, the sole restraint on his rapacity, and that of his ruffianly myrmidons; and hence his sons and his successors evinced at once an enmity to the spiritual power, and an opposition to its authority over the temporalities of the Church. Hence arose the distinction between the spiritual and the temporal power of the Popes; as if the spiritual power could possibly be exercised without interfering with temporalities. If a prince chose to rob a bishop, and was sentenced to excommunication, necessarily the sentence affected the

temporality, for it interfered with his robbery. In fact, the spirituality would be absolutely useless unless it did interfere with the temporality. The very object of a divine law is to govern men in their dealings with temporality. And if the Church shrunk from interfering with temporality, she must cease to enforce that divine law. Save such crimes as affect God only—almost all sins affect the temporality either of spiritual persons or secular. And unless sacrilege were no sin—that is, unless robbery were no sin if it was committed on a spiritual person or spiritual property; then the sentences of the Church must enforce the divine law in cases of spoliation of Church property, or abandon her warfare altogether. Rapacious powers cared nothing for the spiritual. It was only for the temporal they thirsted. And if allowed to exercise their will and satiate their appetite for spoil, what would have become of the Church, what would have become of the poor, who were dependant upon her property for support? and, indeed, how could the divine law be enforced by excommunication upon the mass of the people, if it was not enforced upon loftier offenders? Was robbery no sin if committed by a prince? and was the crime which was worthy of temporal and eternal death if committed by a peasant, a thing of no account if perpetrated by a knight? Strange, that writers who affect to be sticklers for liberty and equality, should fail to see and appreciate the grand sense of justice, and the equality of rule which actuated the Church, in upholding her spiritual jurisdiction alike over sovereigns and over subjects! Strange that it should not be seen that the power of the Church was the only protection for liberty; and that the sentence of excommunication was the sole means of enforcing, against temporal princes, the rules of morality and equity. No wonder that the Norman princes and their tools, the Norman lawyers, sought to circumscribe to the utmost the jurisdiction of the Church. In the time of Henry III., we find that they had established the practice of issuing prohibitions from the king's courts, to restrain them from proceeding in every suit which the king's lawyers chose to think interfered with the rights of the crown or the regality or temporality of the realm, i.e. with temporal property. The result, of course, was to establish a claim on the part of the temporal courts to restrain at their pleasure the exercise of the spiritual jurisdiction of the Church. All sin, (as we have already ob-

served,) save such as concerned God only, affected temporal property or temporal rights; and whatever did so, the lawyers construed as concerning the temporality or regality of the realm; and were ready to issue prohibitions to the spiritual courts. The consequence was a struggle which continued from the reign of the conqueror to the age of Edward III., and could scarcely be said to have been quite closed until the Reformation. It was a struggle simply for the exercise of the spiritual power of the Church. In other words, so far as regards England, it was a struggle for the existence of the Church. For she ceased to exist in England when she ceased to exercise power. And the object of the king's courts was to subject her exercise of power to their will; which of course was to deprive her of all independent power at all. Dr. Lingard himself wrote: "If we may believe the celebrated Grosteteste, the prohibition of the king's courts, by the ingenuity of the lawyers and the presumption of the judges, had been multiplied beyond all reasonable bounds; the cognizance of all kinds of causes was gradually withdrawn from the ecclesiastical tribunals; and the bishops and their officers were perpetually interrupted and harassed in the exercise of their undoubted jurisdiction."* That jurisdiction certainly was undoubted, if we regard the Saxon constitution, as established by the Saxon laws, still extant. But the Norman sovereigns, though they all swore to govern according to those laws, really ruled upon the principle that theirs was a conquest of England, and that they had a right to impose upon the country their own laws. Hence the struggles in which St. Anselm and St. Thomas were champions not less of the nation than of the Church. Hence the Great Charter won both for Church and nation by the Church. Hence the efforts directed against the Church by the crown with the acquiescence of an ungrateful nation. The nation more or less rejected the Norman despotism, but allowed its yoke to be fastened on the Church. It was the Norman, not the Saxon laws, which gave the king's courts power to restrain the spiritual courts in the exercise of their jurisdiction; and it was the Saxon laws which the Norman sovereigns swore to observe.

How repeatedly the Church aided the people in restraining tyranny, the history of those times, the statute book, and

the Great Charters, sufficiently attest. And, unhappily, it is equally clear how cruelly the Church was repaid. The nation virtually handed over the Church to the tyranny of the crown. The commons in effect said to the king: "deal with the clergy as you will, so that you let us escape." The result was that the Church was enslaved. The Norman monarchs wanted money, and cared not much how they got it, so that they had it. The money of the clergy was as welcome as that of the laity, and easier to be got. The clergy were not so likely to rebel as a turbulent and ignorant laity. And as the first Edward was a crafty and politic prince, he made his first attacks upon the Church, in accordance with popular prejudices, and directed them against *aliens*; under this specious pretext his ablest successors pressed the encroachments on the Holy See, dealing with it as a foreign power.

In the early part of the reign of Edward I., when he confirmed the Great Charter, his confirmation ran thus:

"Because our Lord the king hath great zeal and desire to redress the state of the realm, in such things as required amendment, for the common profit of Holy Church, and of the realm; and because *the state of Holy Church hath been evil kept, and the prelates and religious persons grieved many ways.* 'First, the king commandeth that the peace of Holy Church be kept,' " &c.

Every charter and every statute of those times points to the conclusion that the temporal power had been encroaching on the spiritual. This, for instance, is shown very clearly in the 9th Edward II., where it is declared,

"That whereas the king's letters have been directed unto ordinaries, that have *wrapped* those that be in subjection unto them in the sentence of excommunication,—that they should assoil (absolve) them by a certain day, or else appear and show wherefore they have excommunicated them, the king decreeth that hereafter no such letters shall be suffered to go forth, but (except) in case where it is found that the regal prerogative (*regiam libertatem*) be prejudiced by the excommunication."

Now, it is obvious that this practically amounted to a claim by the king, that he and all those who acted under him should be exempted from the spiritual power of the Church. They might commit any act of spoliation or sacrilege; they might "commit the oldest sin the newest kind of way," and yet they were to be exempt from spi-

ritual censures, and admitted without reserve to the sacraments, however contumacious, however impenitent, however resolved not to make reparation.

And so in 15th Edward II. it is declared and enacted,

“But whereas commissions have newly (recently) been made to justices, that they shall make enquiries as to whether the judges of Holy Church make just process in *causes which notoriously pertain to the cognizance of Holy Church*—such commissions shall be repealed.”

Here there is a significant indication of the encroachments constantly made by the crown upon the Church. So in 19th Edward III.

“Whereas the prelates have shown that the secular justices do accroach to their cognizance of voidance of benefice, &c., whereof of right cognizance belongeth to Holy Church, the justices shall henceforth receive the challenges made by any prelate of Holy Church.”

And, again, in the same year, occurs a remarkable recognition of the way in which, at common law, the king asserted his temporal rights, viz., by seizure of the temporal property of the prelates who resisted him: but who all the while were fully recognized in their spiritual authority.

“Whereas the temporalities of archbishops and bishops have been oftentimes taken to the king's hand, for contempts done to him, &c., the justices who shall henceforth give judgment against any prelate, in such case or the like, shall receive a reasonable fine.”

The judges in that age were for the most part, as we have shown, sordid and servile, ready instruments of the power which was strongest. There are a host of other proofs of this than the legislative recital above cited, though that is evidence emphatic enough. The learned work entitled, “The Judges of England,” teems with instances of judges removed arbitrarily, or on the ground of corruption. It matters not whether in all instances these charges were correct. In vast many cases they clearly were, and in other instances their arbitrary removal shows that their judicial decisions were worth nothing when given in favour of the crown.

The truth is, that our Norman rulers were tyrants,

They sought to rule as despots, and did so as far as they were able. Those among them who were able, ruled despotically, and with almost absolute tyranny, except so far as occasionally they were restrained by the power of the Church, supported by popular faith. The Great Charters were, through the course of two centuries, repeatedly confirmed, only to be continually disregarded. Throughout the reign of Edward I. there were successive confirmations, reciting that they had not been observed; and the power of the Church was perpetually appealed to, and the terrors of excommunication legislatively invoked, in order to give the provisions of the Charter efficacy. In spite of all, the extent of tyranny practically exercised by the king may be conceived from one of the statutes passed towards the end of the reign of Edward I., which recites that there "is a great grievance in the realm, and damage without measure, for that the king and ministers of his house do take the goods of clerks and lay people without paying them for any thing, or else much less than the value." As well of the clergy as of the laity, be it remarked. And other statutes refer to similar exactions on religious houses. It is one of the rare errors of omission on the part of Dr. Lingard, that while he notices this as regards the *laity*, he does not as regards the *clergy*. The *statutes* mention *both*.

The statutes and charters, the result in a great degree of the courage and spirit of ecclesiastics, at once taught the sovereigns the necessity of some art to conceal while satisfying their tyranny, and suggested the only safe means of satiating their rapacity;—open spoliation was no longer politic; it provoked opposition:—flagrant oppression had already elicited the heroic courage of saints:—it now called forth the protests of parliaments. With regard to the laity, the rising power of the commons soon secured them: as to the clergy—the monarchs saw that they would henceforth prove the easier prey. But still it was deemed prudent to use artifice, and if possible by false pretences to secure the cooperation of the laity in enslaving the clergy. To enslave was thought the safer way of spoiling them. To plunder ecclesiastics in the manner of open robbery was to act an outrage abhorrent to the feelings of the people, to provoke excommunication, and to risk resistance. It was obviously safer for the enemies of the Church to act under cover and colour of *law*.

It was a far surer way of securing their aims to put bad bishops into her sees than to enter into contest with good ones. It was easier to work by collusion with the bad than to encounter the opposition of the other. If the bishoprics and richer benefices were filled with subservient and sordid ecclesiastics, the selfish objects could be answered, and mastery over the Church easily secured. Simoniacal contracts could be carried out; sordid bargains could be made; bad bishops would be supple and subservient; and bad priests would supply plenty of bad bishops. The aim of the secular power was therefore to wrest from the Pope his control over the patronage of the Church. To this end, the subtlety of the lawyers was set to work, and the prejudices of the people were appealed to; and under the pretence of legislation against presentations to "aliens," an attempt was made first by corrupt judicial decisions, and then by acts of parliament to deprive the Pope of his power as "Sovereign Patron" (so the law of England styled him) "of Holy Church."

To appreciate the hypocrisy of the outcry raised against papal "provisions," or appointments to bishoprics or benefices, on the score of their being usually in favour of aliens or foreigners, it is necessary to observe that it was originally not only from manifest necessity, but at the urgent entreaty of the Norman sovereigns, that foreign ecclesiastics were introduced into this country. The fact is, as the contemporary historians—William of Malmsbury, for instance, or Orderic Vitalis—abundantly testify, the English clergy were often too ignorant for high ecclesiastical rank. Mr. Tyrwhitt, in his Introduction to his edition of Chaucer, remarked that under the Conqueror's reign all ecclesiastical preferments were given to his Norman chaplains; and English bishops and abbots were in many instances removed, and their places supplied by foreigners. In short, in the space of a very few years all the sees of England were filled with Normans, or strangers naturalized in Normandy, and the greater part of the abbeys of the kingdom were under Norman governors. "It must be allowed," adds Mr. Tyrwhitt, "that the *confessed superiority in literature* of the Norman clergy over the English, furnished the king with a specious pretext for these promotions." No doubt this was so. Any how, they were made by the Norman sovereigns, or by the Pope at their request, and with their consent. The consequence was,

that at the beginning of the twelfth century nearly all the bishops and abbots were foreigners. This state of things, says Mr. Tyrwhitt,) seems to have continued, with little variation, till the reign of Edward III. There had been outbreaks of national jealousy, sometimes outbursts of popular fury, against the "aliens" among the clergy, specially in the reign of Henry III. But under the Edwards it was, that the courts of law and the legislature first showed a leaning against papal provisions.

It was now seen how little the Norman sovereigns or their barons had cared for the ignorance of the clergy, since the persons they appointed to benefices were too often exceedingly ignorant, and not unfrequently were not even in holy orders. The fact is, they prostituted the right of patronage to purposes of plunder; and collusively appointed persons to benefices who would allow them to spoil the church lands, just as the early Norman sovereigns had sought to impose on the Church bad bishops, who would connive at the spoliation of their temporalities. The Holy See, on the other hand, strove to sustain the sanctity of the sacerdotal office, as well as the integrity of Church property, and struggled to secure that the holders of benefices should be priests, and that priests should be properly instructed. About the end of the thirteenth century, and all through the fourteenth, many papal constitutions were established for these objects. Thus, in 1300, Pope Boniface VIII. published an edict, ordering the incumbents of benefices to quit their cures for a certain time, and to study at the universities. Warton, in his "History of English Poetry," truly states that "our ecclesiastical registers are full of licenses granted for this purpose. He gives this as an instance. "The rector of Bedhampton, Lancs, being only an acolyte, was permitted to study for seven years, on condition that within one year he was made a sub-deacon, and after seven years a deacon and priest." Several other similar instances are given, in the early part of the fourteenth century, during the reign of Edward I. Now it is not likely that the Popes would have given benefices to persons not in holy orders, and so ignorant as to make it necessary to require them to be absent from their benefices for years acquiring instruction. It is tolerably certain that such persons were presented by the princes or the barons, who being themselves very ignorant, were not likely to hold know-

ledge in much esteem, or to be very good judges of their qualifications as incumbents, especially as they cared so little for the Church, and exercised such shameful tyranny over it, as to give its lands to persons not priests at all. And it was at this very time that the hostility to papal presentations had reached its height, and in this very reign the judges were ready to declare them illegal, and did so, whenever the king or his barons chose to dispute their validity, as we shall show.

No wonder, then, that if the patronage of the Church was in the hands of such men, the priesthood should be ignorant. And if it be true, as Wicliffe asserted, that the beneficed priests of his age knew not the Ten Commandments, nor to read their Psalter, then the cause is clear enough; and that was, the dominion over the Church of that lay power which he so paupered to, and the restriction of that papal power which he so resisted and reviled. That there was great ignorance among the clergy, regular and secular, in the age of Edward III., is indisputable, and it would be wonderful if there had not been. At an episcopal visitation of such bishops as William of Wykeham and William of Waynfleet, it was not uncommon for them to take order for the due instruction of priests in the reading and writing of Latin. But the thing to be noted is, that Protestant writers, in dwelling on these instances of ignorance, always overlook that the *cause* of it was lay patronage, and that the only *remedies* applied to the evil emanated from papal and episcopal authority. The king and the barons thrust into the benefices of the Church ignorant men, their courtiers and dependants; the Popes and the bishops, or rather the Popes and the good bishops—for there were bad bishops in those days, who were thrust upon the Church by the royal power, and who sometimes proved as servile as the judges—took every possible means to instruct. The evil, however, and the abuse emanated from the royal power, the antidote from the papal.

It is pretty plain that whatever might have been the ignorance of the Saxon clergy, it was rather the pretext than the real reason for that preference of the Normans which followed the conquest, and which arose, it is obvious, from political motives. In the reign of John, however, when the English crown lost Normandy, and England was thoroughly subjected to a Norman dynasty, the Norman

race in England had merged in the English, and the Normans abroad were deemed foreigners and aliens. For a long time before, those who were born in England, although of Norman origin, had been considered denizens, and very soon after the loss of Normandy, the natives of that country, as of any other part of France, were considered aliens. The consequence was, an ordinance in the reign of Henry III., by which they were prevented from holding "lands" in England; and from that time there ensued a constant struggle with the Pope, on the part of the English sovereigns, against the appointment of aliens to benefices or bishoprics in this country. In this struggle the sovereigns had the sympathy of the barons, who sought, as their princes did, to exercise their patronage in favour of their own dependants; and the contemporary historians record frequent outbursts of popular jealousy against the "foreigners;" outrages secretly aided and abetted by the king and the nobility. Edward I., a politic sovereign, took advantage of this national jealousy, and such was the real origin of the celebrated statute of provisors passed under Edward III.

In the reign of Henry III., we find from the monkish historians, arose that jealousy against "foreigners," which was so skilfully taken advantage of by his politic successor. In 1307 the statute *de apportis religiosorum*, (the 35th Edward I.) set forth recitals, which throw a clear light on the real origin of that jealousy of the Holy See, which characterized the age. It was simply jealousy about money. The Norman kings were as jealous of foreign abbots as of Popes, if they took any money out of the realm. The statute recited,

"That whereas monasteries, priories, and other religious houses, were founded to the honour and glory of God, and the advancement of holy Church, by the king and his progenitors, and noblemen of his realm, and their ancestors; and a very great portion of lands and tenements have been given by them to the said monasteries, etc., to the religious men serving God in them, to the intent that clerks and laymen might be admitted in such monasteries, etc., and that sick and feeble men might be maintained; hospitality, almsgiving, and other charitable deeds, might be done; and that in them prayers might be said for the souls of the said founders and their heirs; the abbots, priors, and governors of the said houses, and certain aliens, their superiors, have at their own pleasure set tallages, payments, and divers unwonted impositions, upon the houses in subjection unto them in England, etc., without the privity

of the king and his nobility, and thereby the number of religious persons and others in the said houses being oppressed by such impositions, is diminished."

The hypocrisy of these pretences, and of these professions of concern for religious houses, may be tested by the recital of another statute passed a few years afterwards, disclosing that the king and his great men "charged" religious houses most grievously. The plain truth is, that "the king and his great men" were very jealous of the property of the religious houses, much for the same reason that Judas was jealous about the poor-bag. They regarded it as so much public treasure for themselves, and hence their continual protests against "treasure" being "carried out of the realm." That is the burden of their complaint in all the statutes passed against the Church. From the statutes against religious houses, passed by Edward I., to the statutes against papal provisions to benefices, under Edward III., the cry is always as to *money, money, money!* No other ground of complaint is stated.

It is plain that already the evil influence of the Norman tyranny had produced its ill effects, in a decline of the Catholic spirit of charity. The oppressions exercised upon the Church, the spoliations practised on the religious houses, and their consequent impoverishment, (which as the recitals of the statutes already cited show, had compelled them to diminish their alms and hospitality,) the appointment of the bad bishops, who were often by the king forced upon the Church, and their criminal complicity in thrusting bad priests into benefices; all these causes, combined with the evil influence of examples such as these upon the clergy, had produced a wide-spread decline of religion, opening a tempting subject for satire, and a large field for scandal. These were elements of mischief of which the irreligious or the heretical, of course, did not fail to take advantage; and even the poetry of men like Langland testifies that the corruption of the time fully equalled what might be expected from the oppressions exercised upon the Church.

In the reign of Edward I. it was that the judges began to show some subserviency to the new-born jealousy of papal provisions. And in that reign we find the grossest instances of judicial perfidy and iniquity. In the learned work of Mr. Foss, *The Judges of England*, we find under this

eign many examples of the most infamous corruption among the judges,* and several were fined, some degraded, some actually branded with felony. These were the judges who were equally ready to betray their duty to the Crown and the Church, to God and man. Ready to take bribes to pervert judgment, they were as ready, "from fear or favour," to pronounce papal provisions to be null, and papal excommunications to be unlawful. In such an age it was seen that bad bishops are made of the same stuff as bad judges, and good courtiers made either the one or the other. Indeed the judicial and ecclesiastical dignitaries were alike constantly seen in close alliance and immediate connection with the court. It was not uncommon for a judge to be made a bishop. Robert Burnel, the treasurer, and chancellor, under Edward I., was made bishop, and afterwards elected archbishop. The Pope, however, would not have him, which shows what the Vicar of Christ thought of such bishops. They might be good bishops for the king, but hardly so for the Church. Bishop Burnel (it is written) was an active and wise minister, serving the *crown* with zeal, energy, and prudence. No doubt. He lived until the close of the thirteenth century. The same was, for the first quarter of the next century, occupied by another king's minister, one who had been "Chancellor of the Exchequer," and then became canon, king's chaplain, and lastly bishop.

Good bishops, however, were friends of freedom; such as, for instance, Langton, who was chancellor after Burnel, and held the seals in 1300, when the statute *articuli super chartas* passed, confirming the Great Charter. Langton was some years after made bishop, and his zeal and courage in the discharge of his episcopal functions, showed that he had not been corrupted by the secular offices he had held. He excommunicated Earl Warrenne, for adultery. The earl dared to attempt, with his ruffianly retainers, to lay hands on him. The bishop, aided by his servants, successfully resisted him, and threw him into prison. Courage, fidelity, and charity, are kindred virtues, and generally go together. This courageous prelate was as charitable as he was spirited. He was, says the learned Protestant writer we have re-

* Vol. iii. p. 40-45.

ferred to,* very bountiful to his See ; and in the University of Oxford, founded a chest, still called by his name, out of which any poor graduate might, on proper security, borrow a small sum for his immediate necessities. Nor was he at all a singular instance of such munificence. On the contrary, it was the *ordinary* characteristic of the episcopacy of the age. And such were the Prelates who were foremost in maintaining freedom against the tyranny of the crown.

Dr. Lingard has given the form of the oath taken by Edward II. " 'To confirm the laws and customs granted to them by the ancient kings of England, righteous and devout to God, and especially the laws and customs granted to the clergy and people, by the glorious King Edward the Confessor.' " The king bound himself to this by oath ; and the recitals of his statute book, and his ultimate and well-merited fate, are the best proofs of his disregard of the obligation. Dr. Lingard mentions, that the king, under the influence of his favourite, Gaveston, dismissed the Chancellor, the Judges, and the Treasurer, Langton, Bishop of Lichfield, who, by refusing to supply money for his pleasures, had incurred the enmity of the prince and favourite, and was thrown into prison. We can add to this, that this Langton, *Walter* de Langton, is to be distinguished from *John* de Langton, Bishop of Chichester, who received the Great Seal as Chancellor (succeeding Ralph de Baldoch, Bishop of London,) on the accession of Edward II., and this Chancellor appears to have taken a similar course to that of his namesake, the Treasurer ; for the Great Seal was taken from him before it was affixed to a patent, creating Gaveston Lord Lieutenant of Ireland ; whence it is to be inferred, that he did not think proper to be a party to the appointment of one who was looked upon with aversion by the nation.

Dr. Lingard states a fact which shows that the bishops generally were here, as in so many instances, opposed to arbitrary rule, to profligacy and tyranny ; for, when by common consent, the favourite was banished, they pronounced against him the sentence of excommunication if he should return. The King wrote to the Pope in favour of his favourite, and the Holy Father returned, as the

* Foss, vol. iii. p. 275.

successor of St. Peter never has failed to do, an answer imbued both with the spirit of wisdom and of benignity,—or this answer was, that he might be absolved from the sentence of exile and excommunication, if he should submit to the judgment of the Church, and make answer to the charges against him. So long as he showed any disposition to conform to these conditions, the nobility and the nation were willing that he should remain; but he violated those conditions, and his life soon paid the forfeit of his folly, as his master afterwards paid the penalty of his self-will. Dr. Lingard takes care to enumerate the ten articles of the Commons' complaint against the king. And curiously enough the first is, that the king's purveyors took provisions without paying for them. This was exactly what the *monasteries* had to complain of, and their complaint is recorded in the statute book, and admitted to be just. We regret that Dr. Lingard omitted to mention this, because he *specially* states that it was only the complaint of the *commons*; and also states, that their petition "enumerated those abuses which, for more than a century, continued to irritate and harass the people." This is one among many instances of the light which history may gain from the statute book. The Church and the people were suffering under *common* grievances, and this alone would account for the leading part taken by ecclesiastics in the movements against tyranny. Dr. Lingard states that the "committee of ordainers," which assumed the redress of grievances, setting a precedent, copied under the reign of Richard II., "consisted of seven *prelates* and fourteen barons, who swore to discharge their office to the honour of God, of the Church, and of the king and people, according to right and reason, and the oath which he took at his coronation." These "ordinances" appear to have been directed to the observance of the Great Charters, and to have embraced alike the rights of the Church and of the people. Here again, as in the ancient charters, we see the Church a power favourable to freedom, and the prelate labouring for maintenance of liberty. Dr. Lingard does not fail to mention that Archbishop Winchelsea, as the contemporary historians state, was the great abuse of the barons in these measures.

The popular idea that arbitrary princes, such as Edward II., were subservient to the Holy See, is absurdly

erroneous. Edward I. was as arbitrary as Henry I. ; but, wiser and more politic, he commenced that subtle course of policy in which he was followed by the most clever of his successors, of representing, as separate and opposite, the interests of the Church and the nation, and thus depriving the Church of the support of the people, in order that he might the better oppress both. With less sagacious sovereigns there was the same jealousy of the Holy See, not united with the same crafty policy. Thus, Dr. Lingard says truly, "no prince seems to have carried this jealousy further than Edward II. When John XXII. had sent the Bishops of Vienne and Ostia, to negotiate a reconciliation between him and his consort, Isabella,—though they had personally informed him that they had brought with them no letters of any description that could affect his interests, or those of his subjects, the Constable of Dover was directed to address them," in a speech which the reverend historian mildly calls "uncourteous."

Had the mediation of the Church been attended to by the foolish king, the enmities would not have arisen which resulted in the murder of Thomas of Lancaster, grandson of Henry III. This was probably the real cause of the king's ultimate deposition. Dr. Lingard states, that, among the people, and especially among the clergy, there existed a strong feeling in favour of the unfortunate Earl of Lancaster. "Men looked on the earl and his followers as the champions of their liberties." The nation never forgave his murder, (for murder it was,) which entirely alienated them from the king ; and his friends, including more than one prelate, were the chief agents in Edward's deposition. It is plain that Edward owed his fate to his arbitrary and profligate rule, and that he had rendered himself equally odious to the Church and the nation, and that his deposition—the first instance in English history of such an event—was the retribution of oppression upon both. The peers in this, as in all similar movements in favour of liberty, acted in concurrence with the prelates, and did not consider themselves in the right until they were sanctioned in their measures by the Church. Thus, faith and freedom went hand in hand, and the Church was the champion of liberty. She had no share in the barbarities of that age: she sought to soften and to mitigate them,—she suffered by them. More than one prelate was murdered, amidst the outbreaks which characterized the age.

The murders of peers, and prelates, and knights, (for the “executions” of that age were really murders,) show the savage spirit of the times,—a spirit which had ever marked the Norman rule, and with which the Church had long been struggling in vain. It was the spirit in which the first Norman sovereigns had striven to enslave her, and in that same spirit their successor, the second Edward, was now deposed.

It marks the savage and the servile spirit of the satellites of royalty in that age, that Trussel, the judge who had advised Edward to the murder of Lancaster, should (as Dr. Lingard observed) have been the ready instrument not only of his sovereign’s deposition, but of the judicial murder of one of its defenders, the venerable Earl of Winchester. That a Judge should have condemned a Peer to the penalties of treason for defending one of his sovereign’s castles against his enemies, is sufficient to show the worthlessness of judicial sentences in that sanguinary age. And that he should have passed such a horrible sentence on a nobleman of the age of ninety, shows that such men’s minds were as steeled against compassion as they were insensible either to compunction or to shame. Let it not be for a moment imagined that the prelacy were parties to such atrocities, or even to the deposition of the king. The Archbishop of York, the bishops of London, Rochester, and Carlisle, though summoned by the justiciaries, possibly at the peril of their lives, refused to swear allegiance to the young king, who was seated on his father’s throne. Walter de Langton, the upright Treasurer who had refused to connive at the profligacy of the king’s favourites, equally refused to join with the barons in rebellion against their sovereign, although there is every reason to believe that he sympathized with the just discontent at his conduct; for we find him ultimately resigning his Treasurership, and spending the remainder of his days in the quiet exercise of his episcopal authority.* There is another very remarkable instance of Episcopal fidelity. It is very important to observe that the prelates of this age most faithful to the Holy See, were most remarkable for truly noble qualities. In 1323, John de Stratford, who had been engaged as ambassador from Edward II. to the

* Foss iii. 115.

Papal Court at Avignon, thus became known to the Pontiff (John XXII.), who, when the Bishop of Winchester died at his court while engaged in the same embassy, acquired the right, according to usage, of presenting to the vacant bishopric. The Pope exercised that right in favour of Stratford, which annoyed the king, who desired to present one of his courtiers. We give the sequel in the words of Mr. Foss. "The King's anger was excessive. He remonstrated with the Pope, issued directions to the bailiffs of the different ports to arrest any messenger coming into England with letters on the subject, and expressed the bitterest rancour against the new made prelate, calling him in one of his missives 'pseudo nuntium' and 'adversarium nostrum,' and dismissing him from his ambassadorial functions in terms of indignation. On his arrival in England, proceedings were immediately commenced against him in the Court of King's Bench, which were removed to the parliament. In them he was addressed merely by his name, *without the episcopal title*, an omission, which he in his answers was most careful always to supply. By the intercession of the Pope, Stratford was at last reluctantly recognized, and had his temporalities restored." The sequel shows how ill-founded is the notion that fidelity to Rome is inconsistent with true loyalty to the Crown. "From that time he enjoyed the full confidence of the King, to whom he faithfully adhered when others had deserted the royal cause." In a few months the unhappy king paid the penalty of his self-will, and suffered, in his deposition, the retribution of his rebellion against Christ's Vicar, and the wrath of "Him by whom kings reign." The Bishop afterwards became Primate and Chancellor under Edward III., and continued so for the first twenty years of his reign. It was not until ten years afterwards that the king and his parliament perpetrated the first great act of legislative and national rebellion against Rome, by passing the "statute of provisors." So as to Langham, Archbishop some years later. The Pope made him Cardinal, and the king taking umbrage at it, he resigned his archbishopric rather than come either into a compromise or contest with the king, and retired to the Papal Court. The Pope (Gregory XI. a canonized Saint) recognised his fidelity to St. Peter's See, and some years after, having been piously engaged in striving to restore peace between France and England, he

regained the king's esteem, and is styled in the treaties, "the Cardinal of Canterbury," and the "king's dear and faithful friend." Now mark, the illustrious Langham was *munificent* and despised money. If there were ever any bad bishops appointed, it will be always found that it was owing to royal, not papal intervention, and to the pressure of the royal power upon the Pope, involving very often the awkward alternative of a bad bishop or no bishop at all. If the Pope appointed a bishop the king did not like, there was a risk that the temporalities might be withheld, and the see kept practically vacant. Hence in this as in other matters, the Pontiffs were forced to acquiesce in the least of two evils; and thus it was for example that when in 1313 the monks of Canterbury had elected to the vacant archbishopric a learned and excellent man, the King forced the Pontiff to set aside the election, and appoint Walter Reginald, a royal favourite. The sequel showed that the pontiff's choice was better than the king's. The courtier proved faithless both to his sovereign and the pope. Some years after, the adulterous queen of Edward II. persuaded him to consecrate a friend of hers, James de Berkeley, Bishop of Exeter; and the pusillanimous Archbishop, "more fearful of the prevailing and present power of the Sovereign than that of the Pope at a distance," (these are the words of a Protestant writer, and, alas! they have often proved as true as in this case,) did not dare to resist. The Holy Father, deeming Berkeley utterly unworthy, was so severe in his censures of the Archbishop's subserviency, that they proved the precursor of his death. The story shows the mischief of a courtly prelacy.

There is a passage in Dr. Lingard's History, at the conclusion of his account of the reign of Edward II. which we venture to consider not altogether reconcilable with the facts he himself states, and still less with others which we have deemed it important to add. "The first Edward had been in disposition a tyrant. As often as he dared, he had trampled on the liberties or invaded the property of his subjects, and yet he died in his bed, respected by his barons, and admired by his contemporaries. His son, the second Edward, was of a less imperious character, no acts of injustice or oppression were attributed to him, yet he was deposed from his throne." As to Edward I., his reign was disturbed by rebellions, indicating anything but "respect" of his barons: the historian

had already indicated what can hardly be doubted, that his death was hastened by the "vexation" arising from the failure of his iniquitous attacks on Scotland: and if ever "the sins of the father were visited on the children," that dread sentence was verified in the fate of the sons of Edward I. To say nothing of Thomas of Lancaster, one son, his successor, was deposed, with the concurrence of his child, and murdered with the connivance of his wife; and another son, the Earl of Kent, was murdered by her paramour. As to Edward II., the incidents narrated by Dr. Lingard surely show that he was not of "less imperious character" than his father, the difference being rather that he was a weak and foolish tyrant, while his father was a politic and able despot—too powerful to be dethroned, too clever to be despised. That Edward II. was guilty of systematic injustice and oppression, the complaints of the commons, set forth by Dr. Lingard, not less than those of the Church, which he omits to mention, and the recitals of the statute-book, amply establish. And when, in addition to all this, it is considered that his deposition was the result of an alienation of the nation, mainly owing to his murder of a Prince, looked up to both by church and people as the champion of liberty, it can scarcely be denied that he met the retribution of an arbitrary rule, from which both Church and nation had suffered oppression. His character and fate resembled that of Richard II. The character and career of Edward I. rather resembled that of Edward III.: but it would, we think, be a grievous error to imagine that because they were more able princes, and they therefore escaped a fate so signally disastrous, they are to be deemed to have furnished no examples of divine retribution. The wars of both, brave as they were, resulted ultimately in disappointment, as they deserved to do; for they were unjust. Edward I. lost his hold on Scotland; Edward III. had lost his footing in France. To monarchs of their character this must have been a punishment more bitter than death. There can be no question that it hastened the death of both. Of each it might be said that he "died in his bed;" but it could scarcely be said that either died a glorious or happy death, dying amidst failure, disaster, and disgrace: while of both it might be said that their sins were visited upon their children. The accession of Edward III. was under circumstances singularly painful,

He was a party to the deposition of his father; he then connived at the murder of his father's brother by the paramour of his father's wife. He then himself seized power under circumstances casting the foulest stigma on his mother's character. The Holy Father, with the wisdom and charity which ever characterize the Holy See, wrote to him, conjuring him not to publish his mother's shame. But what must have been the feelings of a sovereign succeeding to the throne through the slaughter of one parent, and the shame of the other? Such were the auspices under which he entered on a reign filled with useless and unjust wars abroad, and continual acts of oppression and injustice at home. Dr. Lingard distinctly points out that the claims on France set up by the king were utterly groundless; and the only result of the wars he engaged in was a vain reputation for military glory, and an undying international animosity. Such was the idle policy of the great Edward abroad; at home it was marked by perpetual exactions, resulting in a sort of reciprocal extortion; the king extorting money from the people; the people extorting privileges from the king. If any permanent good arose from this system, it clearly must have been owing rather to the nation than the sovereign. And who taught the nation? The Church. Who led the nation? The Prelates, far more than the Peers. In this as in former reigns, the Peers, in their struggles with the Crown, never moved until they gained the sanction of the Church. Throughout this era in our history, the Church was the champion of liberty; and faith and freedom asserted their ancient union.

When Primate and Chancellor, Stratford refused to make himself the instrument of those oppressive exactions which the absurd wars of Edward rendered necessary—and the Archbishop was persecuted. “When he was summoned,” writes Dr. Lingard, “to appear before the king, he appealed to the provisions of the Great Charter; renewed the ancient excommunication against those who should violate the liberties of Englishmen, and reminded the monarch of the fate of his father, who had by his arbitrary proceedings forfeited the love of his subjects.” A struggle ensued, the end of which was that at the just prayer of the lords and commoners, the king was compelled to receive Stratford into favour; and the process against him was ordered to be erased as contrary to reason and

truth. The people were with the Primate, for they knew him to be a true patriot.

Such, in general, was the character of the prelates of that age. Equally faithful to their God and loyal to their sovereign; true to the Church and to the nation, they countenanced neither unjust exactions nor unrighteous rebellions; and under the wise and benign guidance of the Holy See, stood up for the rights of the sovereign and the nation, and acted as the arbiters of their contests; and, as far as possible, as the pacificators of Europe.

Yet it was in this reign that legislature began to take a suicidally anti-papal direction. Previously to this, as already indicated, the judges had become servile, while the *laity* were ignorant, selfish, sensual and sordid. The laity were willing that the *Church* should be plundered, so that *they* were spared. The lawyers were ready to show that she might be plundered according to law.

How completely the *judges* were under the control of the Crown may be easily conceived when it is recollected that they were *removeable at pleasure*; an arbitrary power continually exercised, as it was in the case of John Stonor,* who was a judge under Edward III., and was repeatedly removed and restored for reasons purely arbitrary. Of what value were judicial decisions in those days, wherever the rights or pretensions of the Crown were concerned?

Skipwith was another of those servile judges whose venality was equal to their subserviency. He was a judge ready enough to enforce the laws of Edward III. against the Papacy, and in 1358 was cited before the Pope for pronouncing a judgment against a bishop, and was excommunicated for contumacy. This was no prejudice to him in the eyes of the king, and he was made Chief Justice in 1361. But he was removed in four years; it is said, for many enormities against law and justice. It matters not whether this was so or not. If it was, it shows how sordid he was; if not, it sufficiently accounts for his being so servile, that he was so arbitrarily removeable; and he soon recovered the royal favour.

How subservient to the royal will were the judges and even the ecclesiastics of this age, some examples will serve to show; and they will at the same time illustrate the

* Ancestor of Lord Camoys.

truth that those who are wanting in fidelity to Christ's vicar will be equally wanting in integrity. The judges, who were most remarkable for servility, were equally odious for venality. In the reign of Edward III. there was one John Thoresby, who was in an office in Chancery. Having in 1310 been served in court with a monition to appear before the Pope in some appeal, the papal messengers were straightway committed to prison as guilty of contempt; and were released only at the intercession of queen Philippa. He subsequently held for many years a variety of secular offices and only late in life became a bishop; being almost immediately after made Chancellor. This was a year or two before the "Statute of provisors," (1350); he was chancellor when it passed, and having, in passing it, shewn the fruits of the secular spirit he had cherished all his life, he soon after equally exhibited the dishonesty of the sordid pretexts under which it was passed, by utterly disregarding it in *his own instance*, and for his own advantage; for he sought the royal provision for the Primacy and obtained it in 1352!

The Chancellor who succeeded Thoresby imitated his example in cautiously preserving the papal favour as far as consistent with worldly interest, but no further; and preferring the king to Christ's vicar whenever it was for his earthly advantage. This is curiously illustrated in the story of his elevation to the see of Winchester. Like his predecessor, he took care to get the papal provision, so as to secure the *spiritual* title. Having got this, then for fear of losing the *temporal* title, by arousing the king's wrath, he *disavowed* the papal provision and accepted the temporalities from the king with a protest against it. This was in 1345. It forcibly reminds us of what was done by Cranmer three hundred years afterwards, when he got the *vallium* from the Pope, and took his oath of subjection to papal authority, with a secret protest against it; the oath for his soul and conscience, the protest for the king's will! The worldly-minded bishop of Winchester, when offered the See of Canterbury, uttered the coarse answer that, "Canterbury was the higher rack, but Winchester was the better manger;" an answer perfectly characteristic of himself, and other courtly ecclesiastics of his age. He was primate more than twenty years, during the latter part of the reign of Edward, doubtless during all that time concurring in his anti-papal policy. Yet all the

while the good prelate was moral, charitable and exemplary in the discharge of his episcopal functions, and wrote divers religious works. He was not a bad man, far from it; had he been one, the Pope would not have made him Archbishop. But his "heart was not perfect with God," for he served his king more faithfully than he did his God, and preferred the world to the Church, whenever they came into collision.

Robert de Thorpe, who was Chief Justice about the time Thoresby was Chancellor, was a worse man; not more servile to the Crown, but wanting in honesty. He was removed in disgrace for bribery. And we mark the fact on account of what is recorded of this Thorpe in the Year Books, in regard to his sycophantish exaltation of the royal prerogative against the authority of Christ's vicar. The spirit he showed was as sanguinary as it was servile, and as servile as it was sordid.

Even under the auspices, however, of Judges so servile and so sordid, the common law of England often acknowledged the papal supremacy. In the early part of the reign of Edward III. occurred a case illustrating the notions which the Crown lawyers were endeavouring, with the aid of servile judges, to introduce; preparatory to legislation against papal presentations. The case is in the 10th Edward III.

"Our lord the king brought *quare impedit* against the Bishop of Norwich, and said that he had disturbed him, and would not let him present to the deanery of Lynne, which is void, and in the gift of the king, by reason that the bishopric of Norwich was vacant in the hands of the late king (father of the present), but that John, the late bishop, had given the deanery, etc., and that the deanery was void, and remained until the temporalities of the see, by the death of the said John, came into the possession of the king that now is, and so it pertained to him to present.—Kelsey. The writ ought to be *ratione temporalium episcopatus*; for the bishopric is a thing spiritual, which cannot come to the king.—Parnell. The temporality and spirituality make a bishop; and as the spirituality cannot come into the hands of a king, the temporalities shall; and in ancient times the kings were accustomed to give the bishopric.—Hank. As well might the king say, that in the time of voidance, he can, as the Pope, give a bishopric, not only in temporalities, but in spiritualities.—Stouford. The spirituality, without the temporality, can be a bishopric; but if the temporality be joined to the spirituality, the Pope cannot give the temporalities, except at the

will of the king. The temporalities may remain in the hands of the king, and yet a bishop can be created."

Thus the king and the king's lawyers sought to make it appear, that the bishop was not bishop until the king conferred the temporalities, and that the Pope had no title to give them. Even conceding the latter point, (which the Holy See never *did* concede, and which is clearly opposed to principle,) the other proposition by no means followed, that a bishop was not bishop until he had the temporalities. On the contrary, the case first cited shows the reverse. Then it followed that the Pope could present a man to the spiritual office of a bishopric or benefice. But if he did, no other person but the Pope's presentee could have title to the temporalities.

It is abundantly evident that the common law of England, if faithfully declared, would permit of no lay interference with the papal supremacy. Hence was passed the celebrated "*statute of provisors of benefices*," which was passed in the twenty-fifth of Edward III., about the year 1350. It expressly refers to the statute of Edward I. against religious houses, and it is avowedly passed on the same grounds. It recites :

"Whereas the holy Church of England was founded in estate of prelacy (*founde en estate de prelacie*) by the king and his progenitors, and the nobles of the realm and their ancestors, to inform them and the people of the law of God, and to make hospitalities and alms, and other works of charity in the places where the churches were founded—and certain possessions (as well in fees (simple), lands, rents, as in advowsons) were assigned by the said founder to the prelates and other people of holy church, to sustain the same charge ; and the king, and nobles, or lords and advowees have and ought to have had the custody of such voidances, and the presentments and collations of the benefices being of such prelacies ; and the kings in times past were wont to have the greatest part of their counsel of such prelates and clergy—the Pope of Rome, accroaching to him the Seignories of such possessions and benefices, doth give the same to aliens who never dwelt in England, and Cardinals who could not live there, and to others, as well aliens or denizens, as if he had been patron or advowee of the said dignities and benefices, as he was not, of right, by the law of England ; whereby if they should be suffered, there should scarcely be any benefice within a short time in the realm, but it should be in the hands of aliens or denizens, by virtue of such provisions, and the said aliens, &c., should fail the said council ; and goods without number be carried out of the

country. And whereas our holy father the Pope, by procurement of clerks and otherwise, hath reserved, and doth daily reserve to his collation, as well archbishoprics and bishoprics as all other dignities and benefices of England which be of the advowries of the people of Holy Church, and doth give the same to *aliens*, and taketh of all such the first-fruits and other profits; and a great part of the treasure of the realm is carried away, and dispended out of the realm."

What was in the mind of the framers of the statute, it is plain, was the *giving away of temporalities by aliens to aliens*, and the *purview* of the act is the prevention of this for the future; hence it enacted,

"That the king and all the people of Holy Church should not be disturbed of their presentments by reservations, collations or provisions of the court of Rome."

This is, we believe, the first mention—curious enough—of that phrase, since so favourite a phrase with bad Catholics—the *court* of Rome as opposed to the *See* of Rome. It is plain that this statute directly interfered with the power of the Holy Father, as supreme Pastor of Christendom. The rights of patronage which existed only by the *indulgence* of the Church, were pressed against her, and made the pretence for resistance of the established rights of the Holy See. The pastoral power of the Holy See was recognized by law. Thus in the Year Book, of twenty-fifth Edward III. the very year in which the statute passed, we read this case:

"Our lord the king brought *quare impedit* against the bishop of Canterbury of a church at B., and declared that one Wm., Archbishop of Canterbury, gave the church to one E, who was received and instituted in the time of the king's father; and that the Pope had made a constitution that a person should not have divers benefices; and ordained that if any one should, after the constitution had been published, hold divers benefices for one month—he should be deprived of all. And that after the constitution had been published, E. had held the church with other churches for a month; by which the church was void, and remained so until the temporalities of the see came into the king's hands by the death of Wm., late archbishop of Canterbury, etc. Mombray objected that the matter lay not in the cognizance of the court, but of the court Christian: the court held that a plea should be pleaded to the action. And the archbishop pleaded that the church was not void while the temporalities were in the hands of the king; on which issue was joined."

Here the Crown actually *relied* upon a papal ordinance, the effect of which was to deprive a person of his benefice. This could only be by virtue of the supreme pastoral power of the Holy See. No legislative confirmation of the papal constitution is relied on. The ordinance itself is deemed sufficient by the Crown lawyers and the court. There was no demurrer, raising any question of law. Issue was joined on the facts. The law was clear. Then if the Pope had power by constitution to deprive persons of their benefices, surely he had equal power to establish a usage under which he conferred benefices.

The practical operation of the statute of provisors, whenever it was enforced, may be shewn by one or two cases. In the Year Book twenty-first Edward III., (four years before the statute passed, so that it is not very intelligible) we read :

“ The king and one A. brought attachment against one R. de G., for that he had made default on a statute,* that no provisor nor other person should bring any bull, or other instrument, in attempting anything touching the patronage of the king. And the declaration was, that whereas the king had presented the said A. to a vicarage which was of his patronage, the said G. claiming to be a provisor thereof, had brought bulls and excommunicated the said A. and others. And the defendant confessed the trespass, and was adjudged to perpetual imprisonment.”

Here the gist of the charge undoubtedly was, not that a layman brought the bulls, but that they were brought against the king's presentation. So that the Holy See's power of excommunication was defied, and a person punished for invoking it, in support of the exercise, by the Pope, of his power as chief Pastor ; a power which the law admitted.

So in the forty-fourth Edward III.

“ Writ upon the statute of provisors, sued by W. Ravesty, for that the defendant had sued to the court of Rome of patronage, which touched the court of our lord the king. Belknap (sergeant) for the king, declared, that whereas the dean and chapter of

* Probably this was some statute or ordinance not regularly passed, (resembling in that respect the so-called “constitutions of Clarendon,”) and so not entered on the rolls. No trace of it is to be found.

The whole story is remarkably illustrative of the state of slavish subserviency in which the judges of those days were kept by the dominant power, whatever that might happen to be.

in the spiritual order, and that to cripple or confine its exercise by the act of the temporal power, would be practically to ignore it altogether; and this, while admitting its existence, and even allowing its exercise, in cases not interfering with royal rapacity, was what the English courts and the English councils actually did. Their decisions evinced *jealousy* of the papal power of excommunication, but clearly admitted its existence.

In the year-book of the 31st Edward III., we read :

“Sir Thomas Seton brought a bill in the Exchequer against S., and showed how he is Justice of our Lord the King; yet the defendant, in the presence of the Treasurer and of the Barons of the Exchequer, openly called him traitor, felon, and robber, &c. And the defendant pleaded a *Bull of the Pope*, proving the plaintiff to be excommunicate : and for that he did not show *any brief* of excommunication, or other thing, *sealed by the archbishop, proving it*, or other seals which would be *authentic*, it was not allowed,” &c.

The case clearly shows that the validity of the Pope's excommunication was recognized; that the introduction of his Bulls was lawful; and that when certified by the archbishop, or bishop, they even operated as a bar in a civil suit. At the end of the report is appended the statement or story already alluded to.

“Thorpe said, that in the time of the king's grandfather, for that one notified an excommunication (of the Pope) against the king's treasurer, the *king* would have had him drawn and hung, but the chancellor knelt before him, and so it was accorded that the man should abjure the realm. And Thorpe said the party here might be in the same case.”

We have already seen what manner of man this Thorpe was; and here he is shown as truculent as he was subservient. The slightest inspection will show how little *his* judicial mind and memory could be relied upon when citing cases in favour of the Crown.

It is not apparent that there was any judicial decision at all; still less that it was adjudged *treason*, (which would have been absurd;) but it rather appears that the matter took place before the king in council; and however this was, it is plain the case was similar to the one regularly reported; viz., it was a case of a private subject, improperly putting forth an *unauthenticated* bull, which might not have been a papal bull after all, and in a temporal suit.

This is expressly made the gist and ground of the decision in this reported case, which alone can be relied upon.

In the year-book 41st Edward III., occurs this curious case, illustrating the remarks already made as to the recognition by the common law of the papal supremacy ; and its exercise in the way of the patronage of the episcopate.

“ The king brought *quare impedit* against William, the Bishop of Sarum, of a prebend in the Church of the Blessed Mary, Sarum, and declared that one John, predecessor of the bishop, was seized of the prebend, and presented it to him who is now bishop, and then died, by which the temporalities thereof came into the possession of the king, until the said William was made bishop, by which the prebend was void, etc.—Candish* (for the bishop). We say that after the death of our predecessor, *our holy father the Pope reserved to himself the bishopric, and gave it to us* ; and afterwards, a long while before we were consecrated, the king reciting by his patent that the Pope had presented to us the bishopric, granted to us the temporalities, and afterwards we were consecrated ; and as he gave us the temporalities before the voidance of the prebend, he can assign no wrong in us. Belknap (*for the crown*), you confess that the Pope had presented you to the Bishopric, by which all your other benefices were voided ; and at that time the temporalities were in the hands of the king.—Finchden (Justice). If one be elected bishop, his benefices are not void until he is consecrated ; and if the king grant him the temporalities after, by his creation the king shall not have the presentment. After he was elected, he had to be confirmed by the Pope, and perhaps the Pope might refuse him for non-ability. When the Pope has given the benefice to a bishop, he has time to accept or not ; but when he is consecrated he cannot refuse and while he may refuse his benefices are not voided.—Chelyre, Justice. When he is confirmed by the Pope, and his temporalities are delivered to him by the king, he has all that a bishop should have, and when he has both the spiritualities and the temporalities, his benefices are void ; and if he die before he is consecrated, the king shall have the temporalities, &c.—Mombrey (Justice). He is not bishop before he is consecrated,” &c.

Here we have the crown lawyers pleading and placing reliance upon, a papal presentation to a bishopric. Neither by them nor by the court, was the validity of the presentation contested ; the question was whether the *mere* presentation made the presentee bishop, or his confirmation and

* This is an abbreviation for Cavendish.

consecration. Yet the lawyers and legislators who admitted that the Pope, as sovereign patron of Holy Church, could present to any bishopric—passed laws to fetter his exercise of this patronage.

Our argument is that the statutes passed against the Pope were a departure from the common law; not an affirmation of it: an affirmation hardly necessary, assuming the law to have been so, considering the servility of the judges, and their subserviency to the royal will.

The argument may be supported by cases occurring even after the statute of provisors. Thus, in the year-book 46th Edward III., twenty years after, we read:

“Quare impedit by the king against the prior of S. The king made title for that by the creation of a certain bishop the hospital was vacant. The incumbent said, that long before the bishop was created the king granted to him the temporalities, and so the bishop presented to the hospital as in his own right. Belknap (*for the crown*) pleaded. And long before that he was bishop by provision of the Pope (*per la purveyance de Pape*), and so in effect all his benefices were void at that time, and it pertained to the king to present.”

Thus, here the crown lawyers relied on a papal provision, while at other times they pretended that such provisions were illegal! They were illegal only by *statute*. Had Dr. Lingard given greater weight to these considerations he never would have written thus:

“The *rivalry* which has been mentioned still existed between the court and ecclesiastical judicatures, and each continued to accuse the encroachments of the other. That those mutual complaints and encroachments were not unfounded, will appear probable if we reflect that the limits of their authority had not been accurately defined.”

This was so, only on account of the contest between the Saxon constitution and the Norman claim of conquest. Upon the Saxon laws there could be no dispute. Dr. Lingard himself, in the same place, speaks of the jurisdiction of the spiritual courts—in the exercise of which they were harassed—as undoubted. It was undoubted by the Saxon constitution. It was questioned only by the Norman sovereigns. The contest arose only under them, which in itself establishes the case of the Church. The fact is, as against Church and nation, the Norman sove-

reigns set up the claims of conquest, and succeeded only as against the Church. Nor against her, until after centuries of contest and of struggle, of the history of which the most material and influential epoch is the age of Edward III.

The jealousy of the sovereign as to the exercise of the right of papal patronage, the existence of which he could not dispute, is illustrated, (as well as the reason for it), by a case which is stated by Lord Coke; probably on the faith of some judicial lecturer, on tradition: as he cites no record or report.

“The abbot of Waltham died since Nicholas was elected abbot; who, for that the abbey was exempt from ordinary jurisdiction, sent to Rome to be confirmed by the Pope; and because the Pope by his constitutions had reserved all such collations to himself, he did recite by his bull that having no regard to the election of the said Nicholas, he gave to him the abbey and the spiritualities and temporalities belonging to the same. This bull was read and considered of in council, and *i. e.*, before all the judges of England (?) it was resolved by them all that it was against the laws of England, &c., as more at large by the said case appeareth.”

The case is cited as of the 46th Edward III.; but no such case can be found, and it does not look like a case judicially determined. If it was so determined, it clearly was the judicial decision, and not the papal bull, which was against the laws of England; so far at least as regarded the ancient *common* law of England; however, it might be a contravention of the statute of provisors. Assuming it to have been so, it serves to show, as all the other cases on the subject do, the sordid origin of the jealousy of papal provisions; for the question was only as to the temporalities, that is to say, the crown admitted the bishop or the abbot to be bishop or abbot, and yet pretended that the being so, conferred no right to the lands of the abbacy or the bishopric, but that they were in the king's gift. The real reason of this claim was illustrated by the royal practice, as to withholding the temporalities of sees. That which the crown only could give, the crown might withhold; and the motive for opposing papal presentations was, that they interfered with royal plunder.

Richard II., a weak but self-willed sovereign, of course followed the example of his illustrious predecessors, in rebellion against Rome. And in 1392, nearly at the close

of his ill-fated reign, passed the last of the statutes directed against the Holy See. It recited :

“ That our Lord the King, and all his liege people, ought, and of old times were wont, to recover their presentments to churches, and other benefices to which they had right to present, cognizance of plea of which presentment belongeth only to the king's courts ; and when judgment was given therein in such cases, Archbishops, Bishops, &c., have made execution of such judgments ; but of late, divers processes be made to our Holy Father the Pope, and censures of excommunication against certain bishops of England, because they have made execution of such commandments ; and it is said, that our Holy Father the Pope hath ordained and purposed to translate certain prelates of the realm, (some out of the realm,) without the king's assent and knowledge, and without the assent of the said prelates which shall be so translated by which the statutes of the realm would be defeated, and the said subjects of the realm carried away, and also the *substance and treasure* of the realm,” &c.

“ And so the crown of England, which hath been so free that it hath been in no earthly subjection, but immediately subject to God *in all things touching the regalty of the said crown*, should be subject to the Pope, and the laws of the realm by him be defeated, in destruction of the sovereignty of the king, his crown, and regalty.”

It is observable how the prelates *tampered* with the question, and how equivocal was their answer ; showing under what compulsion they spoke.

“ Protesting that it is not in their mind to *affirm or deny* that our Holy Father the Pope may excommunicate bishops, &c., said, that *if* any executions of processes made in the king's courts, *as before*, (i. e. according to the old law,) ‘ be made, and censures of excommunication be made against any bishops, &c., for that they have made execution of such judgments, and if any translations be made, &c., so that the substance of the realm may be consumed,’ (as the commons then alleged) ‘ that the same is against the king and his crown, and that the said Lords spiritual will, and ought to be, with the king in these cases, in lawfully maintaining his crown, and in all other cases touching his crown and his regalty, as they be bound by their legiance.’ ”

Whereupon it was ordained,

“ That if any purchase or pursue in the court of Rome, or elsewhere, any *such* processes and sentences of excommunication, bulls, or any other things which touch the king, against him, his crown, and his regalty, or his realm, as aforesaid, then they shall be put out of the king's protection.”

Now as to what "touches the king, his crown, or regalty," the servile crown lawyers, or the equally servile judges, (removeable arbitrarily by the crown), were to decide. What their decisions were worth, the foolish king sadly experienced; and the silly sovereign who so vainly asserted that his crown was not subject to the authority of Christ's Vicar, soon after lost it, in manifest retribution for his rebellion against the vicegerent of Him by whom kings reign.

The character of Richard II., and of the age, is illustrated in a story told by Mr. Foss. The Bishop of Norwich had been convicted of some "default," and his temporalities seized into the king's hands. Their restoration being solicited by Arundel, Bishop of Ely, the Chancellor (De la Pole,) said: "What is it, my lord, that you ask of the king? Seems it to you a small matter for him to part with the temporalities, *when they yield to his coffers above £1000 a year?* Little need has the king of such counsellors to his loss." Whereupon the bishop roundly replied: "What is that you say, my Lord Michael! know that I desire not of the king that which is his own; *but that which, by the counsel of you, and such as you, he unjustly detains from other men*, and which will never do him any good. If the king's loss weigh with you, why did you accept greedily 1000 marks per annum, when you were made an earl?" The bishop, who made this courageous reply, was afterwards *five* times chancellor, during a period of above a quarter of a century. We want (says Mr. Foss,) no further evidence that he must have been a man of great vigour and capacity of business, and he left a high reputation for learning and intelligence, as for personal courage. Nor was his charity inferior to his courage, while his generosity equalled his ability. His munificence at Ely was splendid. At York he expended large sums on his cathedral. And so at Canterbury, to which see he ultimately succeeded. Weever quotes some Latin verses "in his grace and commendation," and they are worth quoting, (we agree with Mr. Foss,) as illustrating the opinion of his contemporaries.

"Hic Thomas cornitis fuit intulatus,
Clericus aptatus, Doctor de jure creatus:
Legibus ornatus, facundus morigeratus.
Cum Christo gratus, in plebeque magnificatus.

O quam præclarus tam purus et immentatus,
Ad Regale latus tandem fuit illaqueatus.’

Now contrast the character of this illustrious prelate, (who, after all, was not at all a rare specimen of the prelacy of his age,) with the ignorant, sensual; and rapacious nobles, who, on account of their ignorance, envious of the superior accomplishments of the prelates, strove to supplant them in royal favour, by pandering to royal tyranny, and to make up for the absence of their sovereigns’ esteem, by becoming sordid ministers to their vices.

Yet, prelates often in that age found that their sacred characters was no protection against the savage impulses of brute force, and barbarous self-will. The murder of Simon de Sudbury, in the reign of Richard II., under circumstances which, to our mind, have often conveyed the suspicion of some connivance on the part of the king or his counsellors, was only an instance of many that might be adduced. The murder of Archbishop Scrope, by Henry IV., under a pretence of treason, which, Dr. Lingard clearly shows, the parliament treated with contempt; and under a form of judicial proceeding, which only rendered it a savage mockery of justice, was even more atrocious than the murder of Archbishop Salviati, at Florence; for it was in cold blood, and against the solemn protest of a just judge, who refused to have any part in such a ferocious farce, and protested against the pretended trial as illegal.

It is a curious and characteristic illustration of the dishonesty of Protestant historians, that while every school history of England extols the integrity of Chief Justice Gascoigne, in daring to commit to prison a retainer of the Prince of Wales, there is a careful omission to mention the far more heroic courage of the same Chief Justice, in braving the wrath of the king, by refusing to try the Archbishop. This would have been the more remarkable story, by way of illustration of judicial integrity, contrasted with the extreme of judicial servility, because one of the wretched and sordid lawyers, who were ever the ready instruments of tyranny, at once fulfilled the usurper’s will, and perpetrated the horrible iniquity of sentencing a prelate to death, without trial, upon the most miserable pretence of treason—a pretence disbelieved by the people and the parliament. The Protestant historians prefer

recording the fact, that an archbishop was condemned and executed for high treason, carefully omitting to mention, *how*, and by *whom*, he was condemned, and what was the protest of the upright Chief Justice, and what the feelings of the nation about the nefarious transaction.* Dr. Lingard's history in this, as in so many other instances, supplies the studied omission. "The Archbishop, (he writes,) suffered with the constancy, and acquired among the people the reputation of a martyr." Now, mark what follows in the history. "To domestic trouble must be added," (this was only a few years after,) "the state of the king's health, and the anxieties of his conscience; though he was only in his forty-sixth year, he bore about him all the symptoms of declining age. Soon after Archbishop Scrope's insurrection, he became afflicted with the most loathsome eruptions on his face, which, by the common people, were considered as a punishment for the death of that prelate, and a succession of epileptic fits, gradually increasing in violence, was now hurrying him to the grave."

In the whole of history there is not a more remarkable and terrible instance of divine retribution and vengeance. Yet it is all lost to the reader of Protestant histories. Who can contend that it matters nothing of what religion our historians are, or of what creed are those who are to teach our children history? Archbishop Scrope was as much a patriot as the Archbishops who signed the Great Charter. Henry IV. was as much a tyrant as Henry I., and, added to that, he was an usurper. The Archbishop, like many of his predecessors, sanctioned some movement upon the part of the people, to gain redress of grievances,—unhappily he failed,—and underwent a martyrdom for freedom, instead of securing its triumph. But his death was avenged by divine power, and his memory was treasured by the people, while his royal murderer sunk amidst anxiety and agony into an untimely grave.

When usurpers and tyrants found real opponents in the Church, no wonder they regarded the Church with jealousy.

* Would not the heroic refusal of Gascoigne to try the Archbishop have formed a far nobler subject for the decoration [of the House of Lords, than the paltry story about the committal of one of the Prince of Wales's retainers?

in the reign of Henry IV. occurred a case showing early how contrary to the law of the Church, and the ancient law of the Crown, was the statute of provisors against papal presentations.

"The king brought *quare impedit* against the Bishop of Salisbury and against C., the Bishop of St. David's, prebend in the Cathedral of Salisbury, and declared that one Richard, late Bishop of Salisbury, made collation of the prebend to the said C., and that afterwards the said Richard died, &c., by which the temporalities of the see of Sarum came into the hands of the king, who created the said C. Bishop of St. David's, by which the Prebend was void, &c. Morton, (for the Bishop of St. David's) said, that he was possessed of the prebend, until the said Richard had the temporalities of the see of Sarum of the King, and afterwards our holy father the Pope, (apostle) reciting by his Bull that the said C. should be Bishop of St. David's, granted that he should hold all other benefices until the Pope should otherwise ordain," &c.

There was a "demurrer" to the plea, not raising any question as to the bull being pleaded, but as to its effect. And, per Thirning J.,

"The Pope cannot change the law of the land ; for if the king give title by voidance, the Pope cannot do it, by reason of his right. Hankford. The Pope can do all things (*papa omnia potest*)."

And again it was said,

"The Bishop is a person spiritual ; subject to the laws of holy church ; and the Pope can oust him ; and he shall be bound by the act of the Pope ; but if the temporalities fall into the king's hands, he shall have *quare impedit*. Thirning J. It was so in ancient time, and I shall not have any doubts (disputation) of the power of the Pope, (del pouvoir l'appostle); but I see not that by his bulls he can change the law of England," &c.

Afterwards the king abandoned his suit, seeing that it could not be sustained at common law ; and in next term, Morton sued upon the statute of Edward III. against provisors.

"The defendant pleaded, that before C. was created Bishop of St. David's, our holy Father the Pope, of his own will, and not at any suggestion of the said C., granted by his bull, (which the defendant produced,) to the said C., to be Bishop of St. David's," &c.

Upon this again, no question was raised as to the legality of this citation of a bull ; but only as to its effect, and whether it could oust the legal rights of the patron as to

the temporalities. And it was long debated, solely on the ground that it touched the temporal law of the realm. Thus,

“Thirning J. said, when the Pope (l'appostle) makes ‘provision,’ he does it as a sovereign patron of holy Church.”

This is laid down by one of the judges, and was not disputed. The Pope was *sovereign patron*. That was because he was Supreme Pastor. And yet the new-made laws interfered with his power as sovereign patron and Supreme Pastor, and to repeal the law recognized this Pastorship.

Thus, in 25 Edward IV. we find the following case :

“*In quare impedit*, it was declared that the Church was void by deprivation of one C. Nele, for defendant, said, it was not void by deprivation, upon which they were at issue ; and whether it should be tried by a jury or by the bishop was questioned. Catesby (Justice) said, the deprivation is a thing temporal. Pigot (Just.), on the contrary, said it was a thing spiritual, and shall be therefore tried by the bishops. Choke (Just.) said, perhaps he was deprived by the Bishop of Rome, or by the metropolitan, in which case the bishops cannot take notice of deprivation made before them ; and if he had not notice from the metropolitan, he was not bound to take notice of it.” &c.

That is, the Judges admitted that deprivation by the Pope was valid, and only required to be duly notified to the Court by the Archbishop, to have legal effect given to it in a court of law. This is the same doctrine as we have already established by other and earlier cases. And we repeat our inference ; if the Papal *deprivation* was valid, the Papal *presentation* was equally valid.

Nevertheless, the law had rendered the Papal presentation ineffective wherever it interfered with the royal will ; for it allowed the king to deprive a bishop of the full possession of his see, unless he was appointed at the royal pleasure, or ready to purchase the royal favour ; and it totally deprived the Pope of his rights as Sovereign Patron and Supreme Pastor of the Church, in all cases where either royal or any other lay patronage was claimed. The king's courts then claimed cognizance of the question, and if any legal patronage existed, gave effect to it, in despite of the papal presentation.

The practical effect of this was to deprive the Holy See in a very great degree, of its control over the English

Church, and to cripple even its control over the English Episcopate. The inference we draw from this fact is most important, and appears to have hitherto escaped the notice of Catholic writers, viz., that this diminished, to the same extent, the responsibility of the Holy See for the state of the Church.

It is a principle in these days, often and earnestly asserted, and always recognized, that responsibility is limited by power. Let the Papacy have the benefit of the principle. We turn the arguments of its enemies upon themselves. They build upon the rulings of the servile lawyers of the age of Edward, and boast that our Catholic ancestors deprived the Holy See of its patronage over the English Church. Then, let them never endeavour to fasten upon the Holy See the responsibility of the state of the English Church, during the age which followed. From the time of Edward I. to the time of Henry VIII., the Holy See was practically almost entirely deprived of its power over the English Church, in all that related to the appointments to its episcopate, which, of course, influenced the character and condition of the clergy; and the enemies of the Holy See point with triumph to the anti-papal legislation of that period, and eagerly trace its progress, until it developed into the schism of the Reformation. Yet, with unconscious inconsistency, they are in the habit of alluding to the alleged abuses of the Church, to not only excusing, but demanding a separation from the Holy See, which could only be justified on the score of its responsibility for those abuses. How could it be responsible for abuses it had not the power to prevent, or to extirpate? To have asserted its power of patronage would infallibly have been to drive self-willed and sordid sovereigns into that schism, which, in a later age, all its charity and prudence could not avert. Fettered in its power it was freed from responsibility; and even had the English clergy been as bad as they are represented, it would not be the Holy See which would be responsible, but the kings and parliaments of England.

But what was the character of the clergy and the religious orders in that age, before the anti-papal legislation had reached its climax, or produced its full results? Every way creditable to the Church, and as we have already shown,—if ever in any cases discreditable,—it was not the Church which was responsible. The Church was

ever labouring to advance learning and enlightenment, education and literature. The universities had arisen under her encouragement, and to every cathedral was attached a grammar-school, at which the children of the poor could have gratuitous education,—with scholarships for the universities, to stimulate their industry, and elicit all their latent ability. There has never since been so wide a diffusion of the advantages of education, and the records of Chancery, and the enquiries of charity Commissioners show, that we not only have not even emulated and imitated the munificence of the Catholic clergy, in the cause of education, but have suffered these magnificent endowments to be pillaged and misappropriated, insomuch that there scarcely exists in all England a single school of the hundreds they founded, at which the children of the *poor* can obtain a good gratuitous education.

As to the character of the friars, as a body, it is abundantly attested, and elevated far above all the envenomed abuse of Wickliff, or the low and irreligious satirists who sympathized with him,—by the testimony of men like Grosteste, and Richard de Bury. In 1253, such was the eminence of the Franciscan friars at Oxford, (says Warton,) “that the learned bishop, Grosteste, bequeathed all his books to that celebrated seminary.” This was the house in which the renowned Roger Bacon was educated, who, created in the midst of barbarism, and brought to a considerable degree of perfection, the knowledge of mathematics in England, and greatly facilitated many modern discoveries in experimental philosophy. The same fraternity are said to have stored their valuable library with a multitude of Hebrew manuscripts. Richard de Bury, Bishop of Durham, author of “*Philobiblon*,” and the founder of a library at Oxford, is prolix in his praises of the mendicants for their extraordinary diligence in collecting books. Indeed, it became difficult in the beginning of the fifteenth century to find any treatise on the arts, theology, or canon law, commonly exposed to sale; they were all universally bought up by the friars. This is mentioned by Richard Fitzralph, their bitter and professed antagonist; in his discourse before the Pope, at Avignon, in 1357, he adds, without any intention of paying the monks any compliment, that “every one of the mendicant convents were furnished with a ‘great’ and noble library.” Thus, even on the testimony of their enemies, the friars, during

this eventful century, between the age of Grosteste and the age of Wickliffe, were the most energetic friends and teachers of learning.

Whethamstede, the Abbot of St. Albans, in this age, is justly celebrated for his learning, and his liberal patronage of learning. One Adam Eston, educated at Oxford—a Benedictine monk of Norwich, who lived at Rome the greater part of his life,—is said to have written many pieces in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, and he died at Rome in 1397. Other instances of monks who were classical scholars in that age, are by no means rare; and in every monastery there was not only a library, containing all the books that could be collected, whether of sacred or profane literature, but a “scriptorium,” a room dedicated to the work of copying them. Our early histories are mostly owing to monkish writers. Almost the only patrons of literature and scholarship were ecclesiastics, such as Richard of Bury. And almost the only scholars—certainly all the best ones—were priests or friars. Take, for instance, Lydgate. He was a monk of the Benedictine order, of Bury, in Suffolk. After his education, in Oxford, he travelled into France and Italy, and returned a complete master of the language and literature of both countries. “He became (says Warton, from whom this description is taken,) so distinguished a proficient in polite learning, that he opened a school in his monastery for teaching the sons of the nobility the arts of versification and the elegances of composition. He was not only a poet, and a rhetorician; but a geometrician, an astronomer, a theologian, and a disputant.” What English gentlemen of the present day, could compare with this friar? And need we again remind our readers of another friar—Roger Bacon? Yet these are instances only.

Langland, our earliest English poet, was a secular priest, and a fellow of Oriel, Oxford, and we have noticed in an article on Wickliffe the jealousies against the friars which characterised the secular clergy in that age: a jealousy highly honourable to the friars, who were its object. With that jealousy Langland was imbued, and it now and then betrays itself in touches of satire. But the bulk of his poetry is of a healthy and manly character, free from ill feeling, and deeply imbued with the spirit of religion. It is curious how he notices the decline of the genuine

old Catholic usages of hospitality and domestic life, concurrently with the prevalence of avarice.

“ We have no better of our type ; how long it shall endure.
Such lessons lords should love for to hear :
Empty now is the hall every day of the week,
There the lord and the lady like not to sit ;
Now hath each a custom to eat by himself,
In a private parlour for poor men’s sake,
Or in a chamber with no chimney ; and leave the chief hall
That was made for meals—for men to feast in.”

Here the poet laments the disuse of the ancient usages of the master and mistress dining in a common hall with all their servants. And this reminds us to mention that the age of our Edwards, marked as it was by the first legislation against the Church, was also marked by the first harsh legislation against the poor ; several statutes of much severity being passed against them.

It is a singular fact that the earliest of our old English poets was Langland, a priest, and the latest, (we mean before the Elizabethan age), was Lydgate, a monk. Of the former, Warton, the great historian of English poetry, declares that he was copied by Chaucer ; and of the other, the same learned writer says, that he was the first of our writers who moulded the English language in its present form ; that is to say, he was the precursor of all the literary glories of the Elizabethan age. To this it must be added, that Chaucer and Gower owed their education to seminaries established and conducted by the clergy ; and their genius was cherished and enriched by the schools of learning, fostered by the Church. Thus, then, this proud and enlightened England owes her poetry to that religion of Rome which she despises and detests, and her boasted literature to the priesthood and religious orders of the Church she abjures, denounces, and abhors. This is one of the great lessons to be gathered from the age of our Edwards.

Of Wickliffe, our opinion has been already expressed in a former article, but we cannot forbear confirming it by an extract from a standard Protestant work, “ Warton’s History of English Poetry.”

“ It was a lucky circumstance that Wickliffe quarrelled with the Pope. His attacks on superstition at first probably proceeded from

resentment. Wickliffe, who was professor of divinity at Oxford, feeling on many occasions not only his own province invaded, but the privileges of the university diminished by the pretensions of the mendicants, gratified his warmth of temper by throwing out some slight censures against all the four orders, and the Popes, their principal patrons, and abettors. Soon afterwards, he was deprived of the wardenship of Canterbury Hall, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, who appointed a monk in his place. Upon this he appealed to the Pope, who confirmed the archiepiscopal sentence. Wickliffe, highly exasperated at this sentence, immediately gave loose to his indignation, and without restraint or distinction, attacked in numerous sermons and treatises not only the scandalous," (i. e. the supposed,) "enormities of the monks, but even the usurpation of the pontifical power itself, with other ecclesiastical corruptions ;"—

which he did not discover to be "corruptions" until he had been thwarted in his views of worldly advancement.

It may be mentioned that Robert Langland, the author of the satirical poem entitled "*Visions of Pierce Plowman*," written about ten years after the time of the passing of the statute of provisors, i. e., about 1360, was like Wickliffe, a secular priest and fellow of a college at Oxford. The same reasoning by which Warton accounts for the jealousy and aversion of Wickliffe to the friars, equally accounts for the spirit of Langland's satire. At the same time it is important to observe that his satires, unlike Wickliffe's slanders, are not levelled only at the friars or the clergy, but are likewise aimed at the laity. Probably no such vivid feelings of personal enmity and envy had envenomed Langland's pen, or pointed it so peculiarly against the friars, as was the case with Wickliffe. In the "*Visions of Pierce Plowman*," we read

"That folke is not ferme in the feith are free of their goodes,
Ne sorry for their synnes ; so is pride waxen
In religion and make the realme, among riche and poore,
That prayers have no powere the pestilence to stop.
And yet the wretches of this worlde are non aware by other,
Ne for drede of the deth withdrawe naughte of their pride,
Ne beth plenteous to the pore as pure charitie wolde ;
But in gladness and glotenye forgotten their Good,
And breken naughte to the beggere as the book techeth ;
And the more they crynneth and weldeth, welthis and richesses,
And lords of leedis and londes the lesse good they deleth."

In the "*Visions of Pierce Plowman*" occur several pas-

sages illustrative that love of money which the apostle described as the root of all evil ; and which assuredly was so in that age, and pervaded not one class more than another, but certainly was not peculiar to the clergy. The single line,

“ To sing there for simony, for silver is swete”—

shows at least that simony was a sin not unknown, and it was a sin in which laity and clergy must have partaken. So when he has written ;

“ Sirgeants it seemed that served at barre
Pleading for penyes and poundes the law,
And nought for love of our Lord,” &c.

∴ He goes on thus :

“ I see bishops bold and bachelors divine,*
Become clerks of accounts the king for to serve ;
Archdeacons and deacons that dignities have
To preach to the people and poor men to fede,
Be going to London with leave of their bishops,
And be clerks of the King's Bench,” &c., &c.

These lines reveal the jealousy of the courts, not less than the worldliness of the clergy. The clerks of the chancery, of the treasury, &c., were usually ecclesiastics ; as also were the chancellors or Treasurers ; the reason being that the nobility and gentry were too ignorant for such offices. The popes had often remonstrated against the employment of the clergy in secular offices, and the kings desired it, for their own advantage, and often resented these remonstrances.

It is a most remarkable fact, and did not fail to excite the attention of Warton, that in the satirical poetry of Langland may be found a prediction of the confiscation of Church property, which occurred at the Reformation. In the *Visions of Pierce Plowman* we read this curious passage :

“ And there shall come a king, and confesse you, religious,
And bete, you as the Bible telleth, for breaking of your rule :
And amende moniales, monks, and chanoines ;
And then shall the abbott of Abingdon and all his issue for ever
Have a knock of a king, and incurable the wound.”

* Bachelors of divinity.

Again in another passage, after speaking of the Knights Templars, then lately suppressed, he says,

“ Men of Holy Church
Shall turn as Templars did—the time approacheth nere.”

No doubt, as Warton observes, this was a favourite idea with the disciples of Wickliffe, and the “wish was father to the thought.” Still, it serves to show that there were priests in that age already anticipating the awful catastrophe of the Reformation, with all its attendant spoliation, sacrilege and confiscation; and contemplating such a consummation as no remote nor doubtful consequence of the views and ideas then entertained by many.

In our former article on Wickliffe, we showed that it was part of his policy to pander to the rapacity of the nobles, and gained a reputation for sanctity by preaching against the vices of the clergy and the friars. And there is ample evidence that he dealt in wholesale calumny, and himself embodied the vices against which he preached.

To show how reckless were the calumnies of Wickliffe, and how much more truthful were the more charitable portions of Chaucer, it would be easy to multiply various examples of piety among the regular and secular clergy, as well as among the friars. Thus in 1349, there was living a solitary life, Richard of Hampole, an eremite of the order of St. Augustine, who wrote many theological tracts in Latin, and versions in English of the Lord's Prayer, the penitential Psalms, and the book of Job. He also wrote a quaint poem entitled the *Pricking of Conscience*, in which he strove to impress the truths of religion in this homely strain :

“ Thus grete love God to mon kedde,
And many good dedus to hym dyd,
Therefore every mon lerned and lewd *
Schulde thynke on love that he hym schewed,
And these good dedus hold in mynde,
That he then did for mankynde;
And love and thanke Hym as he con,
And els so be unkinde mon :
But he serve him day and night,
And his giftes use them right,

* Lewd meant rude.

So spend hys wit in Goddes servyce,
Utterly else he is not wyse ;
But he know kindly what God is,
And what mon is that is les.
How febul mon is, soul and body ;
How strong God is, and mighty :
How mon greveth God that dos not well,
How mones worthe therefore to fell ;
How merciful and gracious God is,
And how full of all goodness," &c.

The *Canterbury Tales* of Chaucer present many satirical features, which are eagerly laid hold of by Protestant critics as representing the clergy, regular and secular, of the age of Edward III. without at all considering the character of the author. He was a dependant of a profligate prince, who for twenty years lived in sin with another man's wife, whose sister (in the meantime) Chaucer himself married. In this brief glimpse of his life we have shown him an irreligious and reckless character. And the tone of his poetry is such as might be expected from such antecedents ; it is often obscene and indecent in the lowest degree. Now it is a curious illustration of the moral blindness of Protestantism, that it should take the loose and licentious poetry of such a man as this, as affording any trustworthy description of the *general* character of the clergy, or the religious orders ! As if the Scriptures did not emphatically teach that there is no fellowship, but enmity between Christ and Belial ; between God and mammon ; between the flesh and the spirit ; so that a loose and licentious character must have a natural repugnance to all that is religious, and an instinctive disposition to deride and despise it, and a desire to hold it up to obloquy and ridicule. This is the very characteristic of an irreligious man. And what are his sarcasms worth, as descriptive of the general character of religious people ? Protestants themselves would object to any satires upon themselves written by loose sceptics. And why, then, are they so uncandid as to take for gospel the satires of an obscene and immoral writer ?

Let us just give an illustration of the unfair eagerness with which expressions of Chaucer are seized upon, and the untrue ideas which they are calculated to convey, as opposed to *authentic* records of the age. In the *Canterbury Tales* is a picture a "Monke."

“ An outrider that loved venerie,
A manly man, to be an abbot able,
Full many a dainty hors he had in stable,” &c.

and this is taken as a faithful portraiture of abbots in the thirteenth and fourteenth century. But let us look at a few more authentic features of such characters. In the same century, the priory and convent of St. Swithins, Winchester, thus recommended one of their brethren to the convent of Hyde, as a proper person to be preferred to the abbacy of the convent then vacant.

1st enim confrater ille noster in glosanda de sacra pagina bene versatus, in scriptura peritus, in capitalibus literis appingendis bonus et exactus; in regula S. Benedicti instructissimus, psallendo doctissimus;

that is to say, the qualifications of an abbot were, his skill in caligraphy, and in copying and transcribing the scriptures, his acquaintance with the rule of his order, his proficiency in sacred chanting. Here is an authentic document, really valid and valuable evidence.

Our enlightened and acute Protestants disregard this evidence and prefer the isolated and ill-considered opinion of a loose and licentious poet! And then they rail at the ignorance and stupidity of the monks! Ah! there is no stupidity like the stupidity of pride!

There are many passages in Chaucer's poems which seem to point rather to the “poor priests” of Wickliffe than to the friars whom they calumniated and the clergy who slandered. Speaking of those who worked only for avarice and covetise,” Chaucer wrote:

“ Elke in the same sect are set
All they that preachen for to get,
Worship, honor, and rechesse;
Then heartes are in great distresse
That folke live not holily;
But aboven all specially
Such as preachen vain glore,
And toward God have no memoree,
But fath do hypocrites trace,
And to their souls death purchase,
And outward shewing holynesse
Though they be full of cursednesse;
For oft good predication
Cometh of evil intention

To him not vaileth his preaching,
 All helpe he other with his teaching,
 For where they good example take
 There is he with vaine glorie shake."

He goes on to speak sarcastically of those

"Who spake full faire in their praying."

He says that whoso will find "False Semblance,"

"He must in *worldly* folke him seke
 And certes in the cloisters eke (also)
 And certainly artfullest hiding
 Is underneath humblest clothing."

This hit the "poor priests" of Wickliffe, (who went about in their coarse gowns) not less than the friars in their serge habits.

The poet went on to write ;

"But natheless I will not blame
 Religious folke, ne them diffame,
 In what habite that ever they go:
 Religion humble, and true also,
 Will I not blame ne despise."

And he explains that he means the "*false* religious."

"That willen in an habite go
 And setten not their herte thereto."

This is very different from the tone of the "Canterbury Tales," (which holds up all friars to derision), and it is also very different from the language of Wickliffe, who held up all friars to execration; denouncing the entire orders. Chaucer in the "Romaunt of the Roses," which we conceive to be the earlier, and, morally, the better poem,—goes on to make "False Semblance" say,

"I dwell with them that provide be,
 And full of wiles and subteltie,
 That worship of this world coveiten (do covet)
 And go and gather great pitaunces,
 And purchase there the acquaintaunces
 Of men that mightie life may lead,
 And faine them poor and themselves feed
 With good morsels delicious,
 And drunken good wine precious,

And preach us poverty and distresse,
And fishen themselves great richesse."

ll this hits Wickliffe's "poor priests" not less than the s, and appears rather to refer to the former, for it was rather than the friars who in Chaucer's time "pured themselves the acquaintance" of men that mighty were leading; "and gathered great pitaunces." For once, the arch-heretic Wickliffe took care to become 's chaplain and royal professor, and rector of a good fice, despite all his professions about poverty; he also care to secure the patronage and protection of John aunt. And Wickliffe's "poor clerks," although he written a tract entitled, "why poor clerks have no fices, (professing that they refused them), showed iselves as eager as their master after good preferment, 1 they could get it; and although they railed at the s indiscriminately, the experience of Chaucer led him r more sensible and charitable conclusions;

"Habit ne maketh nor monke ne frere,
But cleane life and devotion
Maketh men of good religion,
Good herte maketh the good thought,
The clothing geveth ne reveth nought:
The good thought and the working,
That maketh the religion flowing,
There lieth the good religion,
After the right intention."

nd then with equal sense and candour he makes "False blance" confess that he assumes his disguise in every and rank of socity.

"Now am I knight, now chastelaine,
Now prelate and now chaplaine,
Now priest, now clerk, now friare,
Now am I mastere, now scollere,
Now monk, now canon, now baily:
Whatever mister man am I,
Now am I prince now am I page,
And can by herte every language,
Now am I Robin, now Robert;
Now frere minor, now jacobin;
Sometimes a woman's clothes take I,
Now am I maid, now lady.

Sometimes I am a prioresse,
 And now a nonne and now an abbesse ;
 What will ye turn? In every wise
 Right as me best I me disguise ? ”

There is no railing here at any particular class; the laity not less than the clergy, the secular clergy not less than the religious, are represented as infested by the vice of hypocrisy: while other passages show that the poet equally recognized in all classes the existence of genuine piety. The tone is not that of a scoffer at religion. It is rather in sorrow than in scorn that the poet alludes to “wolves in sheep’s clothing,” and foes within the fold of the Church.

“Who so took a weather’s skin
 And wrapped a greedy wolfe therein,
 If he should go with lambes white,
 Weanst thou not he would them bite ?
 Yes, natheless as he were wood,
 He would them worry and drink the blood ;
 And will the rather them decieve,
 For since they could not percieve,
 His treachere and crueltie ;
 They would him folow, although he fle,
 If there be wolves of such hue
 Amongst these apostles new ;
 Thou holy Church, thou maist be waild,
 Since that thy city is assailed,
 Through knights of thine own table.”

The allusion here to “the new apostles,” can hardly be explained except by reference to Wickliffe’s “poor priests,” who had gone about the country preaching, as they pretended, a purer gospel. There is nothing in Chaucer’s dependance on John of Gaunt inconsistent with this view; since when that prince found Wickliffe to be an impious heretic, he disowned him, and doubtless was disgusted, as Chaucer seems to have been, with his hypocrisy not less than his heresy. There is another passage in the same poem, in which there is an allusion, (as we venture to think), to Wickliffe’s “poor priests;” that in which “False Semblance” assumes an aspect of one

“Whose looking was not disdeinous
 Ne proud but meeke and full feesible,

About his neck he bare a Bible,
But in his sleve he gan to throng
A rasa sharpe and well liting."

And then the poet goes on to describe the union between "abstinence" or false asceticism, and "wicked tongue," or calumny.

There is, we think, great reason to infer from these and a vast number of other similar passages in the works of Chaucer and contemporary writers, that they clearly saw that it was among the assailants of the Holy See and the accusers of the clergy and the religious orders that the worst characters were to be found; that the calumniators of the brethren exemplified the vices they imputed to others; that the faithful children of the Church were those whose character was creditable and whose conduct was exemplary. Anyhow, the authorities we have cited, and the facts we have stated, surely show that in truth it was so; and that so far from disaffection to Rome resulting from a love of liberty or religion, it was ever associated with impurity, hypocrisy, and rapacity. The facts of contemporary history show, that prelates and priests most loyal to the Holy See, were most faithful to their sacred calling—most liberal, charitable, and devout. On the other hand, the opponents of the Holy See were friends of kingly tyranny or pandered to kingly rapacity—were irreligious, servile, avaricious, and impure. We find the Church ever labouring to promote religion and learning,—we find under her auspices faith and intellectual enlightenment advanced, and piety and charity promoting education. We find her crippled in her holy work by a sensual sovereign and rapacious princes; and at last, by a series of hostile laws, supported by some judicial decisions, practically deprived of her power. Up to that time, we find, in spite of all the obstacles interposed by the brutality of the laity, and rapacity of princes, education extended, and piety and charity diffused. Such is the chequered character of the age of Edward III. The fruits of the fatal policy then pursued were realized in a later age. For the present it is sufficient to have shown, what we undertook to show, that for all the *good* of the age of Edward III., the Church should have the glory: for all the evil, the State and its anti-papal legislation must be deemed to have been responsible. Never after

the age of the Confessor—never since the Norman Conquest, had the Church its true power and influence in this country; and under our first Edwards, she was all but entirely enslaved. Those who first plundered her and afterwards bound and fettered her that they might plunder her the better, were responsible for any evils and abuses that afterwards arose. Even when bound, she struggled mightily with the powers of evil, and though crippled effected vast good; and that good constitutes all that is really the glory of the age of Edward III.

ART. V.—1. *Christianity and Mankind, their Beginnings and Prospects.* By Christian Charles Josias Bunsen, D. D., D. C. L. 7 vols. 8vo. London, Longmans, 1854.

2. *Hippolytus und Kallistus, von J. Döllinger.* 8vo., Regensburg, 1853.

3. *Die Theologischen Streitigkeiten in der Römischen Kirche in der ersten Hälfte des dritten Jahrhunderts, (Theologische Quartalschrift. Drittes Quartalheft,)* Tübingen, 1855.

THE Episode of the Philosophumena, which, during the three last years, has contributed to enliven the traditional dulness of historical controversy, may now be said to have run its course. The nine-days wonder, together with the host of wonders which it was to have brought in its train, is at an end.

Our readers will recollect the note of triumph with which it was ushered in. Its appearance was hailed as an era in ecclesiastical history. It was described by one enthusiastic admirer as a rending of the veil behind which the true beginnings of the Church had been so long concealed, and under whose cover all the frauds and forgeries of Rome had been devised,—a letting in of light upon the darkness, to which alone these frauds had been indebted for the ignorant acquiescence which they so long enjoyed. To the fervid imagination of another it was the disentomb-

ment of a buried city. And even the most sober-minded did not hesitate to accept it as the most valuable picture of early Christian life which had yet been recovered ; especially valuable as the work of a contemporary—a living sketch of the doctrinal, constitutional, disciplinary, and social, condition of the Church in the beginning of the third century.


But it was above all in the controversies with Rome that the value of this discovery was vaunted. The tone adopted by the [writer towards the Popes Zephyrinus and Callistus, was accepted as completely decisive against the existence in the Church, at that period, of any notion of the Papal supremacy, such as it is now recognized by Catholics. His personal sketches of these popes, both of whom are canonized saints of the modern calendar, were held to be fatal to their pretensions to sanctity. Above all, his picture of Zephyrinus, as a corrupt patron of heretics, and of Callistus as himself a heretic, and even the inventor of a new heresy, was exultingly appealed to as putting an end for ever to the monstrous assumption of Papal infallibility.

Happily, despite these menacing denunciations, the Church has outlived the ordeal ; and if we might judge of her inherent vitality from the vigour which she exhibits at any particular period of her career, we would augur from the signs of life which the recent concordat with Austria displays, that she may still hope to survive other crises yet to come, even more formidable than the publication of the *Philosophumena*. We shall show indeed, hereafter, that she has come forth from that ordeal purer and more vigorous, if it be allowable to use the phrase, than when she was submitted to it.

It would be an interesting and curious study to trace the history of the numberless fancied discoveries of the same kind, which, from time to time, have been brought forward, by their authors, as fatal to the pretensions of Rome, or to some one or other of her contested doctrines. Cardinal Wiseman, in his masterly lectures on the connection of Science and Revealed Religion, has beautifully shown how every science in its first beginnings appeared to threaten to prove irreconcilable with the received doctrines of revelation, and yet, how, as soon as each acquired sufficient form to be employed as a safe medium for the investigation of truth ; as soon as in each a sufficient body

of facts had been ascertained, and a sufficient set of data had been established to constitute a secure basis for scientific deduction; from that time forward each science had become the handmaid of revelation instead of its antagonist; and, far from disproving or casting doubt upon its conclusions, had but tended to supply new motives of credibility for them all, and to present each to the understanding in a new and yet more attractive light. The objections against the Mosaic history from the Chinese chronology speedily disappeared before the light of historical criticism. The pretended astronomical periods of ancient India, needed but to be examined by the rules of astronomical science as laid down by its modern masters, in order to the exposure of their utter baselessness. The impious thrones of La Marck and his school hardly outlived the infancy of the study of comparative physiology. The geological objections of Voltaire, of the Encyclopædists, and the other sciolists of the science, have turned, in the hands of true geologists, into a most interesting confirmation of the simple truth of the Mosaic cosmogony. The fancied conflict between biblical history and the historical antiquities of Egypt and Assyria, has become under the practical investigation of Rawlinson, Layard, and Wilkinson, one of the most beautiful and convincing among the evidences of the veracity of the historical books of the Old Testament. And so it has been in a hundred minor instances, even down to the palpable refutation of the Nebular Hypothesis of the *Système de la Nature*, (recently revived in the well-known *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation*,) which is afforded by the revelations of Lord Rosse's telescopes, and the other modern instruments of increased optical power.

It would be curious, if space permitted, to pursue, in reference to the historical grounds of the great doctrines of Catholic controversy, the same interesting inquiry; and to trace, from its origin to its close, the course of each of the various reputed discoveries of historical evidence, which, in their several spheres, were alleged to be fatal to the Catholic views. For the present the *Philosophumena* must suffice as an illustration.

We have already, on two different occasions, entered at some length into this subject. When we first addressed ourselves to the *Philosophumena*, it was an unknown, or at least imperfectly identified, fragment. The first con-


tures regarding it, or at least the reasoning on which they were founded, were vague and unsatisfactory; and even those who spoke with most confidence were compelled to leave many particulars unexplained, and many questions undecided. It has since passed satisfactorily through the ordeal of criticism, and may now take its place among the scanty remains of Ante-Nicene literature. The Chevalier Bunsen, who was one of the first to direct the attention of the theological world to its importance, though he vastly overrated its theological importance, (at least in its bearing upon modern controversy,) may also be said to be the first who has applied it to what alone can be considered its true use—that of an historical document, a monument of an obscure and almost unknown age; not presenting, it is true, a complete or direct picture of the Christian community at the time of its composition, but yet affording much incidental information, and casting much indirect light on what was hitherto unknown, or very imperfectly and conjecturally understood, regarding its condition. M. Bunsen has taken Hippolytus (and the main body of the materials for his sketch of Hippolytus is drawn from the *Philosophumena*) as the representative of one of the ages into which he divides the Historical Section of his *Christianity and Mankind*.

“Christianity and Mankind” purports to be a new edition of M. Bunsen’s former work, “Hippolytus and his Age;” but it has been so much enlarged and so extensively modified, both in the matter which it contains and in the order and method of its discussion, as almost to deserve the name of an entirely new work. Even those portions of it which are not new, are so much extended as often to defy recognition.

Indeed, M. Bunsen’s present publication would have been far more effective, and its object and plan would have been immeasurably more intelligible, if it had been presented to the world in the form of three separate works, rather than in the shape in which it now comes before us. Even as it is, the work is divided into three distinct parts.

The first, in two volumes, is entitled “Hippolytus and his Age, or the Beginnings and Prospects of Christianity.”

The second, also in two volumes, is “Outlines of the Philosophy of Universal History applied to Language and Religion.”

The third, in three volumes, consists mainly of original documents, and is styled "*Analecta Ante-Nicæna*;" the first volume comprising what M. Bunsen considers the most characteristic literary remains of that period; the second, so many of its canonical or constitutional relics, as he regards as genuine monuments of the age; and the third its Liturgical Remains.

Now these three works, undoubtedly, are connected together in the mind of the author, and must be admitted to have a common bearing upon the general theme which he undertakes to discuss. But we must confess our inability to follow out this connexion in M. Bunsen's treatment of the several parts of his subject; and indeed to understand, in some portions of the work, the possibility of any such connexion at all. This want is especially remarkable in the second division; which, nevertheless, is by far the most original, and in many respects the most interesting and valuable of them all. The philological section of this division of the work is a masterly resumé of the results of this great science down to its very latest period; and may be described as a new and more methodical digest of the researches of Adelung and Pritchard; not only as these researches have been modified by the criticisms of the many scholars in each of the separate schools of language, who have subjected these writers to a careful examination; but with much additional material contributed by the author himself, whose authority, as a philologer we gladly recognize, even when we differ from him most widely as a critic and as a theologian.

Gladly however, as we should dwell upon this division of M. Bunsen's work, we are compelled by the necessities of space to pass it over. We regret still more the impossibility of entering at all into the third division of the work, the *Analecta ante-Nicæna*. The documents comprised in this collection, it is true, may well be regarded as of great importance, inasmuch as it is to the ante-Nicene remains that we are to look for the true historical illustration of the doctrine, the constitution, and the worship of the Christians during the first three centuries. But the subject is in itself so vast, and the author has followed so bold and thorough-going a system of criticism, both in the selection of the records themselves, and in the technical questions as to the genuineness, the various readings, and the historical value of those which

he has admitted into his collection, that we could not hope, within any reasonable limits, to do even the faintest justice to our own views on the numberless important questions which he has raised, and many of which he disposes of by wholesale in a few dashing sentences.

For the present, therefore, we shall confine ourselves to the first division of the work, and indeed exclusively to that part of which regards Hippolytus, and more particularly the *Philosophumena*; our main object in this article being to complete our examination of the questions regarding Pope Callistus which originated in the celebrated narrative of the ninth book of that treatise. We shall occasionally refer, however, to the fifth volume of the work, which, among the *Analecta ante-Nicæna*, contains extracts from the text of the *Philosophumena*, and particularly from the ninth book.

Our readers may remember that on two former occasions we entered at some length into this subject. On both occasions, however, we addressed ourselves chiefly to the statements in matters of fact relating to the character and government of Pope Callistus, which were brought forward on the authority of the writer of the ninth book of the *Philosophumena*. In the first article we discussed the question of the authorship as well as of the credibility of this portion of the treatise. In the second, we entered in detail into the consideration of each of the specific charges against the conduct of this Pontiff, and against his administration of the affairs of the Church. We reserved one other topic, the most important indeed of all, the allegation that Callistus formally lapsed into heresy; nay, that he framed a new heresy, or rather that he combined into one system the worst characteristics of two pre-existing heresies, that of Noetus, and that of Theodotus.

A full examination of this grave and startling accusation would have been impossible within the limits at our disposal when last we adverted to the subject. We thought it best, therefore, to reserve it for a separate discussion; and for the time we contented ourselves with suggesting a few brief topics of refutation. We had hoped that, after so many distinguished writers of every imaginable shade of doctrine, naturalists and super-naturalists, the school of Tübingen and the school of Halle, divines of the High Church, of the Low Church, and of the Church of the

Future, should have exercised their ingenuity regarding it, we should be enabled to approach the subject with more advantage, from the variety of lights in which it would have been placed during the course of a discussion so varied and so prolonged.

We regret, however, to say, that in this hope we have been disappointed. The alleged heretical teaching of Pope Callistus has been dealt with most unscientifically by almost every one of the writers who have used the supposed fact as against the authority or the doctrinal infallibility of the Roman See. From the first to the very last—from the Quarterly Reviewer in 1851 down to M. Bunsen in the present year, they all content themselves with assuming, as a matter of course, the truth of the allegation; and conclude that, because Hippolytus declares Callistus to have been a heretic, it is impossible to entertain any doubt of his heterodoxy. The view uniformly taken by all who have written on the subject is the superficial one of Dr. Wordsworth: “that it is too clear from the recital in the ninth book of the newly found treatise, that Callistus lapsed into heresy on a primary article of Christian Faith;” that he did so “in opposition to the exhortation of orthodox bishops;” and that he “strenuously maintained and propagated this heresy by his official authority as bishop of Rome.”*

M. Bunsen, in the new and revised edition of his “Hippolytus and his Age,” perseveres in the same superficial and uncritical treatment of the subject. It is curious to contrast the tenderness exhibited towards those whom all Christian time has regarded as heretics, with the ready asperity of the judgment pronounced *prima facie* against a Roman Pontiff: to compare the jealous criticism with which the accounts given of the early heretics, by Theodoret, by Photius, by Epiphanius, nay, by Irenæus, and even Hippolytus himself, are scanned in all their bearings; how they are examined in themselves and in their relations to each other and to contemporary monuments; how the sources of information from which the account of them is drawn are discussed; and especially, how every known fragment of the writings or expressions of the accused party is pressed into service

* Wordsworth's Hippolytus, pp. 210-11.

for the refutation of the charges against him, or at least the mitigation of the rigour of the adverse judgment which it is impossible to withhold ;—it is curious to compare all this with the prompt and unenquiring acceptance accorded to the palpably exaggerated, intemperate, and inconsistent tirade which forms the sole foundation for the alleged heterodoxy of Pope Callistus.

Not one of those who have accepted the testimony of Hippolytus against this Pontiff, has ever taken the trouble to consider the probability of the charge in itself, or even to analyse the terms in which it is made, with a view to ascertaining how far it may possibly have originated in a misconception of the meaning of Callistus, or in a misrepresentation of his words. Above all, not one has thought it worth while to enquire how far the views of Callistus's accuser himself, were in accordance with the strict terminology of the orthodox formularies ; not one has had the fairness to propose, as at least a possible conjecture, whether it might not be that the very fact of a charge of heterodoxy being preferred from such a quarter, should not rather furnish a presumption in favour of the orthodoxy of the party accused.

Enquiries of this kind are on other occasions a favourite pursuit of M. Bunsen. But his sympathies in the case of Callistus unfortunately stood in the way, and deprived the ill-fated Roman Pontiff of the benefit which his case might expect from the ingenuity and learning of such a critic. He is content, even in his new edition, to leave the narrative of Callistus's adversary unquestioned. He still speaks as before of "Callistianism ;" of "the Callistian branch of Noetianism ;" * he still adopts, without question and without criticism, as a part of his own narrative, Hippolytus's account of the heresy of Callistus ; † nay, he still stops short at a semicolon, as we observed in our first notice of the work—breaking off, even in this one-sided and intemperate statement, at a point which shuts out a most important modification of Callistus's view ; and, although the passage which he thus omits occurs immediately afterwards in a subsequent note ; and though in the first volume of the "*Analecta Ante-Nicæna*," the whole narrative is given entire, yet for the cursory

* Vol. i. p. 428.

† p. 387.

reader of the historical sketch given by M. Bunsen himself, an impression is conveyed as to this implied Noetianism of Callistus, even stronger and more decisive than by the narrative of Hippolytus.

This loose and uncritical method, too, is more to be regretted in M. Bunsen, inasmuch as, unlike Dr. Wordsworth and the other English critics, he distinctly maintains that the opinions of Hippolytus himself on the subject of the Trinity, were not in accordance with the notions of modern Trinitarians, or even with those of the Nicene formularies. He expresses himself very plainly on this point, in speaking of "some people who," he doubts not, will "think it their duty to prove that Hippolytus had the correct doctrine respecting the Athanasian definition of the Three Persons ;"* an attempt which he treats with undisguised ridicule. He declares for himself in another place,† that Hippolytus "was not a Nicæan divine, much less an Athanasian." Nor does he mean by this simply that he did not use the same formulas, although he believed substantially the same doctrines ; for he professes without disguise that "it would not be honest" to say this ; and that every fair critic must allow that Hippolytus's own formulas not only "do not agree with the creeds of the councils," but "move in a different circle of ideas."

Again, in explaining the peculiar views of the doctrine of the Logos which he ascribes to Hippolytus, M. Bunsen adopts the statement of Dorner in his "Treatise on the Person of Christ," that "as it lay very near to this latter view to mix up the Son with finiteness, (a combination which brought Tertullian himself to the verge of Patripassianism, and also placed him in contradiction to himself, since the Son was to spring out of the Eternal Substance of God,) Hippolytus endeavoured to remove this difficulty by strictly distinguishing God as the Only Infinite, the Super-Infinite One, from the world ; but by his determinism, the world, and even the Humanity of Christ, were divested of personality ; and *he is obliged to subject the hypostatic existence of the Son to the omnipotent will of God.* It is true that he turns his glance back from the personality of the Son which comes forth a little later, to His Eternal Substance ; and he tries to draw lines of connection

* I. 466.

† 497.

between the two, speaking of the Eternal predestination of the Personality of the Son. But the Son, it is manifest, is only placed hereby in still more dependance on the omnipotent will of God ; and he considers that Eternal Substance merely as belonging to the Father, and as communicated by Him according to His will and decree to His hypostatic Son.”*

Now we cannot help thinking it strange, that, with these notions of the peculiar views of Hippolytus, it did not occur to M. Bunsen to criticise more strictly his allegations against one who is at issue with him on these very points, before accepting his mere ipse-dixit as decisive evidence of the heterodoxy of that adversary. There is one passage which might lead us to suppose that this idea at least presented itself to M. Bunsen’s mind. He cites, with approval, from professor Jacobi, a passage to the effect, that “Hippolytus identifies Callistus more than is just with the Patripassians ;”† but even this suggestive sentence does not lead him to any development of the circumstances or expressions calculated to disprove, or at least to qualify, the charge of heterodoxy against Callistus which he had adopted ; and he continues to speak of Callistianism as a heresy ; and a branch of Noetianism, just as though there were not a possible doubt of the justice of Hippolytus’s representations.

That exact analysis of Hippolytus’s narrative, and that examination of his charge of heresy against Pope Callistus which we look for in vain in the Protestant critics of the *Philosophumena* have been executed with great learning and success by Dr. Döllinger ; and more recently by Dr. Kuhn, in the excellent *Theological Review* of Tübingen. The subject is so important, both for its own sake and for its bearing on the papal question, that we shall devote a few pages of our present number to a summary review of this portion of it, as it now stands between Callistus and his accuser.

The common vice of all anti-papal writers upon the case of Pope Callistus, has been simply this : they have fastened upon it as an isolated fact ; and, shutting out of view all the antecedents as well as the consequents of the great theological controversy, of which it forms but a single episode,

* I. 463.

† P. 480.

and which only terminates with the triumph of the Nicene formularies at the end of the fourth century ; they have been contented to accept without enquiry, the judgment pronounced upon it by one who was himself a partisan in these contests, and whom his own narrative proves to have been a singularly intemperate, excitable, and reckless partisan.

Now on the contrary, we contend that in order to form a dispassionate judgment of the real sentiments of Callistus, it is absolutely indispensable to consider the position which he holds in this long and complicated controversy.

It is well known that from the days of Cerinthus downwards, the relations between the Father and the Logos, had supplied matter for division in the Church : although the more fanciful and (to the Eastern mind especially) more attractive theories of Gnosticism almost shut it out from our notice during the second century of the Church ; there are discoverable, nevertheless, at intervals, obscure but yet certain traces of its vitality. In the attempt to reconcile the great doctrine of the Unity of God with the scriptural characteristics of the Logos, two different tendencies are observable from the earliest time ;—the one, by identifying the Logos with the Father, whether by representing them as but two different names, or as two different manifestations or relations of the one God ; the other, by depressing the Logos from the position of perfect equality with the Father, and thus maintaining the notion of unity by reserving to the Father alone the essential attributes of the one God. These are the two schools, which, under various modifications, make up the history of the Trinitarian contest before the Council of Nice ; and which are technically known as the Monarchian and the Subordinationian schools.

Between these extremes lies the great Catholic truth of the Nicene Trinity.

The conflict between these two principles became a source of division in the Roman Church about the commencement of the third century. It had commonly been believed until recently, on the authority of Theodoret,* that Noetus of Smyrna, the leading representative of the Monarchian doctrines in the east, was but a disciple of Epigonus

* *Histor. Eccles.* III. 3.

and Cleomenes, whom Theodoret represents as the founders of the heresy. The account given in the *Philosophumena* inverts these relations, and represents Epigonus as a disciple of Noetus, who introduced the doctrines of his master at Rome, and to whom Cleomenes associated himself in the task of propagating the doctrine at Rome.

The chief supporter of this view in Rome was Sabellius, who, indeed, has given his name to the Monarchian doctrine, as it is popularly known in history. The most active and energetic opponent of these views in the same Church, was Hippolytus, the author of the *Philosophumena*. According to his own account, his success against Sabellius was signal and complete. He had all but convinced Sabellius of his error; at least there was every hope that he would not have proved obstinate against his exhortations, had not his measures been disconcerted and their effect neutralized by what he describes as the crafty and sinister conduct of Callistus.

In order to understand fully the charges which Hippolytus makes against the orthodoxy of Callistus, it is necessary to consider separately two distinct phases of the contest; the first, during the pontificate of Zephyrinus, while Callistus was but a private member of the Roman presbytery; the second, after his succeeding to the episcopal chair, upon the death of Zephyrinus. It will be necessary to lay before the reader Hippolytus's narrative of each of these periods.

And first during the pontificate of Zephyrinus.*

"Callistus putting Zephyrinus himself forward publicly induced him to say, 'I know one God Christ Jesus, and beside Him I know none, who was born and suffered.' But he (Callistus) sometimes saying, 'Not the Father suffered, but the Son,' thus kept alive the strife without respite among our people. But we perceiving his devices did not give place to him, confuting him and resisting him for the Truth's sake. Then being driven to infatuation, *because all others went along with him* in his hypocrisy, but I did not, he used to call me a ditheist, disgorging violently the venom which was harboured within him."—p. 247-9.

It will be seen that as regards this part of Callistus's

* We content ourselves in general with Dr. Wordsworth's translation, although in some portions of the account we shall have to call attention to the original itself.

career, the charge against him is one of duplicity and falsehood rather than of heterodoxy; of trying for his own corrupt ends, to retain the good will of each of the opposite parties by professing privately to the members of each that he sympathized with their views. It is worthy of note that Hippolytus does not assert of Callistus that he professed in his own person, and by any definite declaration of his own, to side with both parties. What he alleges is, that, while he himself held a good understanding with one party, he had the craft to put forward Zephyrinus to make a profession which he describes (though, as we shall see, unjustly) as favourable to the other. It is further worthy of note, that the party with which, according to him, Callistus kept terms in his own person, and whose doctrine he professed in his own name, was the orthodox one. He admits that Callistus himself repudiated the Sabellian or Patripassian principle, and declared "not the Father suffered, but the Son." It appears, moreover, by the admission of Hippolytus himself, that, when he (Hippolytus) protested against Callistus's views of the controversy, the latter had the unanimous support of the community; that Hippolytus stood alone in his opposition to him; and further, that there was something in the peculiar line of argument adopted by him, which gave Callistus a pretext for calling him a "ditheist." All these circumstances will be found important in guiding our judgment as to the relative orthodoxy of the parties.

During the first period of his public life, therefore, while he was a simple member of the Roman Presbytery, the charge of heterodoxy against Callistus, stripping it of the scurrilous declamation in which it is enveloped, is reduced to this, that he "professed in private to Sabellius that he was of his opinion," and that in public he put forward Pope Zephyrinus to say, "I know one God, Christ Jesus, and beside Him I know none, who was born and suffered." Whether this be a heretical profession, we reserve for future discussion.

We now pass to Hippolytus's account of the conduct of Callistus after his elevation to the Pontificate.

"Thus it came to pass, that after the death of Zephyrinus, Callistus, imagining he had gained that to which he aspired, cast off Sabellius as heterodox, through fear of me, and supposing that he might thus be able to wipe off the reproach to which he was ex-

posed in the eyes of the Churches, as if he were not of unsound belief. In good truth he was a deceiver and impostor, and in course of time drew many along with him. And harbouring the venom in his bosom, and having no rectitude of mind, and at the same time being ashamed to profess sound doctrine because he had before calumniated me in public and said, 'You are a Ditheist,' and because also he was often charged by Sabellius with having swerved from his first faith, he invented such a heresy as follows. He said that the Word is the Son and is also the Father, being called by different names, but being one indivisible Spirit; and that the Father is not one and the Son another (person), but that they both are one and the same, and that all things are full of a Divine Spirit, both things above and things beneath, and that the Spirit which was Incarnate in the Virgin was not different from the Father, but one and the same, and that this was the meaning of our Lord's words, 'Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me?' (John xiv. 10.) For that which was seen, that is man, was the Son; but the Spirit which was contained in the Son, was the Father. For, said Callistus, 'I will never acknowledge two Gods, the Father and the Son, but One God. For the Father born in Him, having taken human flesh, divinized it by uniting it to Himself, and made it one, so that One God is called Father and Son; and this being One Person cannot be two.' And so he said that the Father had suffered with the Son; for he does not like to say that the Father suffered and was one Person, because he shrinks from blasphemy against the Father, he (forsooth) who is so infatuated and versatile, and extemporizes blasphemy hither and thither, in order only that he may appear to speak against the truth, and is not ashamed of falling at one time into the dogma of Sabellius, and at another into that of Theodotus."—p. 259-263.

A careful analysis of this angry and intemperate statement supplies the following facts, which we glean amid the sneers, insinuations, imputations, and positive misrepresentations of the narrator.

(1.) Whatever may have been Callistus's language or conduct in reference to Sabellius, before he became bishop, his first step, on attaining that dignity, was to cast him off as heterodox. Hippolytus ascribes this act to "fear of himself;" to the desire of "wiping off the reproach of unsound belief in the eyes of the Churches;" and to other selfish motives; but he admits the fact, nevertheless.

(2.) From this time forward, there are two parties in Rome opposed to Sabellius and his form of the Monar-

chian error ; that of Hippolytus himself, and that of Callistus.

(3.) Callistus refused to acquiesce in the line of refutation adopted by Hippolytus against the teaching which they both rejected in common, on the ground that this course of refutation was irreconcilable with the unity of the Godhead. He still called Hippolytus "a Ditheist."

(4.) We further collect that Callistus carried with him, as against Hippolytus, the great body of the faithful and of the clergy. Hippolytus confesses that they "flocked to Callistus, swelling his school," (p. 265.) ; that Callistus's party "was thronged, vaunting their numbers," (p. 267.) ; and that their superiority in this respect was such as to warrant them in "calling themselves the Catholic Church." (p. 271.) He ascribes this success, it is true, to the lax and corrupting moral system which he imputes to Callistus ; but, again, he admits this fact.

When we come to compare the relative lines of argument, as against Sabellius, adopted by Hippolytus and by his adversary, we find ourselves at great disadvantage, as we have no knowledge of the genuine opinions of Callistus, except through the angry and intemperate representations of his fiery adversary. Even from this, however, we glean several facts of much significance.

(5.) He explicitly disclaimed the doctrine that "the Father Suffered."

(6.) With equal distinctness he refused to admit that there was but "one person" in the Godhead.

(7.) It should appear, therefore, at once, that whatever Callistus's differences may have been with Hippolytus, his orthodoxy in the Monarchian controversy is placed beyond all dispute by the very confessions of his adversary.

Very different, however, was the conclusion drawn by that adversary. He distinctly charges Callistus with teaching the Monarchian principle, that "the Word is the Son, and is also the Father, being called by different names, but being one indivisible Spirit ;" that "the Father is not one, and the Son another, but that they both are one and the same ;" that in the Incarnate Word, "that which was seen, that is, Man, was the Son, but the Spirit which was contained in the Son is the Father ;" and that in order to avoid literal identity with the Patripassian inferences of the strict Sabellians, he declared, not that the

Father simply suffered, but that "the Father suffered with the Son."

Such was Hippolytus's view of the line of teaching adopted by Callistus, in order to meet the heresy of Sabellius. In his eyes Callistus merely evaded the technical forms of Sabellianism; he held that he retained its substantial principle—the identification of the personality of the Son with that of the Father.

But, on the other hand, too, we glean from the angry criminations of Hippolytus, that he was not permitted to enjoy a monopoly of the power of imputing heterodoxy; and that, if he condemned as heterodox the line taken by Callistus against Sabellius, Callistus took the same view of his own system of Anti-Sabellianism. If he charged Callistus as a Monarchian, Callistus equally taxed him with being a Ditheist. If he regarded the system of Callistus as involving a unity of person in the Father and the Son, Callistus looked upon his system as fatal to the unity of nature in the same Father and Son. While he taxed Callistus with confounding the distinction of personality, Callistus replied by declaring that Hippolytus exaggerated the distinction of personality and the relations between the persons themselves, so as to make the two Persons two distinct Gods.

Such is the case between the two disputants, even with all the disadvantage to Callistus, which results from its resting entirely on the onesided and clearly intemperate statement of his adversary.

Now, what we complain of in all the Protestant critics of the *Philosophumena*, is, that they have kept out of view the counter-statement of Callistus, which is implied in his very protest against the doctrines of Hippolytus; that they have accepted as decisive evidence of his heterodoxy, the *ipse dixit* of one whom he himself declared to be a heretic on the opposite side; and that, far from giving him the benefit of the light which this imputation on his part against Hippolytus should throw upon his real doctrine, they have, on the contrary, refused him even the miserable justice of a strict and dispassionate scrutiny of his own words and statements as reported by Hippolytus himself. We maintain that it is only by a one-sided and uncritical proceeding of this kind that the imputation of heresy against Pope Callistus, even on the showing of the *Philosophumena* itself, could ever have gained credit.

The case indeed resolves itself into this.

As Callistus, no less than Hippolytus condemned Sabellius and the Patripassians, the difference between them lay in the systems which they severally adopted, in order to explain, in reply to Sabellius, the relations between the Father and the Logos. And because Hippolytus, in defiance of Callistus's explicit profession, thought proper to declare that Callistus's system was, in reality, but another form of Sabellianism, it is at once concluded that Callistus "lapsed into heresy in a primary article of faith in opposition to the exhortations of orthodox teachers!"* It is altogether forgotten that the accusation of heresy made by Hippolytus against Callistus is not a whit more explicit or more distinct than that of Callistus against Hippolytus! If Callistus be a concealed Sabellian in Hippolytus's eyes, Hippolytus was denounced publicly by Callistus as a Ditheist. Surely it is an uncritical prejudging of the case to assume, without further enquiry, that Hippolytus is right and Callistus wrong; or rather to ignore altogether the protest of Callistus and his counter-statement, and pronounce him a heretic on the authority of Hippolytus, as though no doubt had ever been suggested either upon his competency or his trustworthiness as a witness. Surely here, if ever, there is ground for a careful investigation of the real merits of the case; and we contend that no critic, fairly considering the evidence even as it stands in the *Philosophumena*, could arrive at any other conclusion than that of the utter groundlessness of the charge of heresy there preferred against Pope Callistus. It is disproved both by the account which his very adversary himself gives of the doctrine taught by Callistus; and even by an examination of that adversary's own system, the rejection of which constituted in his eyes the worst feature of the heresy of Callistus.

I. We must bear in mind that the error against which, in common with Hippolytus himself, Callistus had to contend,—viz., the denial of the distinct personality of the Father and of the Son,—was to be confuted in such terms as not to compromise the fundamental doctrine of the unity of the Divine Nature, as it exists in both. The Arian heresy, the Photinian heresy, even the various Humanitarian heresies

* Wordsworth's *Hippolytus*, p. 200.

themselves, arose from this exaggeration of the distinction between the persons of the Father and the Son, their authors regarding the co-equality and co-eternity of the Son with the Father as incompatible with that distinction of the Persons.

It is plain that the fear of falling into this error against the Unity, was strongly before the mind of Callistus. "I will never," he emphatically declared, "acknowledge two Gods, the Father and the Son, but one God." He would say nothing which, by representing the nature of the Son as different from that of the Father, could militate against the Unity.

Nevertheless, his adversary is obliged to admit that he shrunk with equal firmness from the opposite error—the Sabellian confusion of all distinction of Persons. "He would not say," writes Hippolytus, "that the Father suffered, and that there is but one Person." And it was distinctly on this ground that he had excommunicated Sabellius.

What then was the system of Callistus?

Plainly it lay between these extremes;—between asserting, on the one hand, that there was but one Person in the Godhead, called by different names; Father, Son, and Spirit, and admitting, on the other, such a notion of the relations between the Father and the Son, or of the nature of the Son Himself, as would amount to exaggerating the distinction of Person into a distinction of Nature.

Now this is precisely the mean which the Catholic faith has ever maintained, and which is formulized with so much care in the Athanasian creed.

How comes it, therefore, that Hippolytus could represent this as Sabellianism, or as at least a mere nominal evasion of Sabellianism?

We shall presently see a very probable explanation of this in the fact that Hippolytus himself fell, at least in language, into that very extreme which Callistus sought to avoid; and that his language as to the nature of the Son might well be deemed inconsistent with the notion of His co-equality, co-eternity, and to adopt the Nicene language, consubstantiality with the Father. But, without recurring to this explanation, we contend, that even the dubious light which his own angry and excited narrative affords, may enable us to discover a very probable solution.

The reader will have observed, that, although, in the body of his accusation against Callistus, Hippolytus describes him as holding that the "One God is called Father and Son, and this, being one Person, cannot be two," yet he is afterwards obliged to confess that Callistus "would not say that there is but one Person." Clearly, therefore, the former words charged upon Callistus are but a gloss of Hippolytus on the language of Callistus, or an inference of his from some doctrine or principle of Callistus, but an inference which the latter himself earnestly disclaimed.

Now, the real statement of Callistus, thus distorted by his adversary into a form which he himself repudiated, is, we hold, clearly discoverable from the very narrative of the *Philosophumena*. But as Dr. Wordsworth's translation of the passage is faulty, and faulty in a matter most unfavourable to Callistus, we think it necessary to transcribe the original text.

Ἐφεύρεν αἰρεσιν τοίανδε, λέγων τὸν λόγον αὐτὸν εἶναι υἱὸν, αὐτὸν καὶ πατέρα, ὀνόματι μὲν καλουμένον, ἔν δέ ὃν τὸ πνεῦμα ἀδιαίρετον, οὐκ ἄλλο εἶναι Πάτερα, ἄλλο δὲ υἱὸν, ἐνδὲ καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ὑπάρχειν. p. 260.

"He invented a heresy such as the following; saying that the Word is the Son, and is also the Father, being so called by name, but being one indivisible spirit, and that the Father is not one (Spirit) and the Son another (Spirit), but that they are both one and the same (Spirit)."

Dr. Wordsworth, by translating this, "and that the Father is not one (*Person*) and the Son another," appears fully to justify the construction put upon it by Hippolytus. It is plain, nevertheless, that nothing could be farther from the mind of Callistus than such a sentiment. He explicitly repudiated the notion that the Father and Son were one Person. Even resting on his words as they stand, and without taking into account the probability of their having received a colouring from the medium through which they come to us, we contend that they are susceptible, in themselves, of a thoroughly orthodox interpretation—an interpretation, indeed, which we are necessitated to adopt by what we otherwise learn to have been the language to which Callistus objected when used by Hippolytus in his conflict with Sabellius.

(1.) Callistus, in denying ἄλλο εἶναι πατέρα, "that the Father was one (Spirit)" and ἄλλο δὲ υἱόν, "the Son another," merely asserts that the Father is not *one God* and the Son *another God*; that there are not *two Gods*.

He himself declares that he did not deny that they were *two Persons*.

(2.) In like manner where he is charged with teaching that "the Spirit which was Incarnate in the Virgin was not different from the Father, but one and the same;" his meaning clearly was, that it was not different in nature, but one and the same. His angry adversary chose to put upon those words a Sabellian interpretation; but this interpretation was, even according to the confession of that adversary, repudiated by Callistus himself. That he meant no more than the identity of Nature, is clear from the very text which he alleges in proof. "Believest thou not that I am in the Father and the Father in me?" the great stronghold of the Athanasian Fathers in the Arian controversy.

(3.) Again, we learn from Hippolytus himself that Callistus explicitly repudiated the idea that "the Father suffered." It seems clear, therefore, that the statement of the "Father's suffering with the Son," attributed to him by Hippolytus, is but a deduction of the writer's own from the doctrine of the unity of personality, which he falsely ascribes to Callistus. Nay, even if it were admitted that he had used that form of expression, it must necessarily be inferred, when it is recollected that he explicitly maintained the distinction of the Persons, that by it he merely meant to convey that the Divinity of the Father was the same in nature with that of the Son, who was incarnate and suffered. In a word, all his various forms of expression which Hippolytus construes into a recognition of one Personality, were in Callistus's mind but so many emphatic modes of indicating the unity of Natures.

And this brings us to the second branch of the subject, viz., to the examination of the language held on this subject by Callistus's accuser himself.

We have seen that in the conflict with Sabellianism our great danger lies in the possibility of insisting upon the distinction between the Father and the Son, to such a degree, or in such a manner, as to compromise the essential doctrine of the identity of the Divine Nature as it exists in both.

It is evident, too, from repeated observations of Hippolytus—from his reiterated complaint that Callistus had called him a Ditheist—from the emphatic declaration which he quotes from Callistus, that he would "never

speak of two Gods ;” and from other similar indications ; not only that Callistus’s principal anxiety was to guard against any expression which could give a sanction to the notion of a difference of nature in the Father and in the Son, but also that it was precisely on this ground that he separated from Hippolytus, and refused to acquiesce in his teaching as against Sabellius.

There is a passage in the epitome of his history of the heresies which Hippolytus gives in the tenth book, which supplies us with the precise point of difference between the two systems. Hippolytus, in order to establish against Callistus the substantial identity of his doctrine with that of Noetus and Cleomenes, argues as follows. “ For he (Callistus) says that God is not a *different Spirit* [ἕτερον πνεῦμα] from the Word, nor this Word from God. They are, therefore, one Person, [προσῶπον] distinct indeed in name, but not in substance.” Hence it would seem that Hippolytus supposed it to be essential to the *distinction of persons* in the Father and the Son, that they should be “ *different spirits*.”

Accordingly, we find that Hippolytus is one of those Fathers whose language of the Son in explaining the generation of the Son, has appeared to many to be inconsistent, when taken literally, with the strict doctrine of the Eternal Generation. It is true that the ambiguity of the language on this head employed by Hippolytus in common with a few other Ante-Nicene Fathers, is removed by the explanation that, when they seem to speak of the Generation of the Word as not from eternity, they allude to the act by which the Word which had always existed in the Father, “ the λογος ἐνδιαθέτος ” came forth from the Father, becoming the “ λογος προφορικός ” for the work of Creation. Nevertheless, the form is in itself doubtful and susceptible of a false construction ; and, especially in a controversy with an acute adversary like Sabellius, might well be deemed by Callistus dangerous and objectionable.

Again, there are other expressions of Hippolytus which tend to confirm this suspicion. His language, taken rigorously, in the very confession of faith which is appended to the Philosophumena, seems to imply the notion of the subordination of the Word, even in His divine nature, to the Father. “ For,” he says, “ simultaneously with His coming forth from Him who begot Him, He hath a voice in Himself, the ideas conceived in the essence of

the Father, when, the Father ordering that the world should be created, the Word executed it, pleasing God.”*

So, again, Hippolytus appears to make the generation of the Son dependant on the will of the Father. In his Oration against Noetus, he speaks of the Father’s “showing forth the Son when He willed, and as He willed.”† Nay, in the Confession of Faith, it would almost seem as if he made the generation of the Son a voluntary act, dependant on the part of the Father, in the same way as it would have been dependant on His will to make us Gods, had He so willed it. “If He had desired to make thee a God, He could have done it: *thou hast the example of the Word.*‡ And although these expressions are also susceptible of the same explanation, yet there can be no doubt that, in a controversy such as the Sabellian, they naturally lead to erroneous conceptions of the nature of the Word, and to false ideas of His relation to the Father.

We can now, with language such as this before us, understand what was the origin, and what the significance, of Pope Callistus’s separation from Hippolytus. We can understand how it was, that when, according to Hippolytus, he had it in his power to set Sabellius right, by joining with Hippolytus in the line of argument which he adopted against that heretic, he nevertheless refused to do so. We can even understand what it was in Callistus’s teaching, that Hippolytus distorts into a “profession of agreeing with Sabellius.”|| [*φάσκοντος τὰ ὅμοια φρονεῖν.*] Because he would not surrender to Hippolytus his belief that the Father and the Son were one and the same Spirit, [πνεῦμα] he was set down, by a hasty conclusion, as agreeing with the heresy which professed that the Father and the Son were one Person. It was in vain that he protested against this inference. It was in vain that he declared that he did *not* hold them to be one Person. Hippolytus knew better. It is true “one God is called Father and Son.” Now “this,” he contended, “being one Person, cannot be two.” And he straightway concluded that, in using language such as this, Callistus necessarily “fell into the dogma of Sabellius.”

* Philosoph. p. 350.

† p. 335.

Οτε ἠθελήσεν, καθως ἠθελήσεν. Cont. Noetum, c. 10. II. p. 13.

‡ Εἰ γὰρ θεόν σέ ἠθελήσε ποιῆσαι, ἔδυνατο· ἔχεις του λόγου τό παράδειγμα. Philos. p. 336. || p. 285.

On the other hand, we can understand the significance of the reproach of "Ditheism," directed against Hippolytus by Callistus. Understanding rigorously the language above alluded to—supposing it to compromise either the co-eternity, or the co-equality, or even the self-existent Divinity, of the Word—Callistus believed that, in the system of Hippolytus, the Nature of the Word was represented as different from that of the Father; that the nature of the Word was subordinate to that of the Father; that the generation of the Word was dependant on the will of the Father; that the Word was a different Spirit [*πνεῦμα*] from the Father; in fine, that the Father and the Word were made, not merely two distinct Persons, but two distinct Gods.

In a word, Callistus, while he formally repudiated the Sabellian heresy, believed that the system adopted by Hippolytus in opposition to the Monarchianism of Sabellius, fell into the opposite error of subordinatianism. With the evidence of such a belief on his part which his very imputation of Ditheism against his adversary affords, we can understand how, in maintaining the Catholic *via media*, he was almost necessarily driven to use expressions which, to the ears of that excited adversary, would convey the impression of the very error which they both in common professed to repudiate.

The reader may have observed another of the imputations made by Hippolytus against the orthodoxy of Callistus, which at first sight presents greater difficulty. He imputes to the Pontiff not only the Sabellian error, but also the opposite error of Theodotus.

How could these contradictory principles ever be combined in the same creed?

Sabellianism confounds the Personality of the Son with that of the Father, representing the Son as but another name for the same Being. But it strongly maintains the Divinity of that Being.

On the contrary, Theodotianism represents Christ as a mere man, and pushes to the utmost extreme the distinction between the Father and the Son Christ; cutting away all the foundation of their unity, by denying to the Son even the semblance of Divinity which the lowest form of subordinatianism ascribed to Him.

Neither Dr. Wordsworth nor M. Bunsen has attempted any satisfactory explanation of this seeming anomaly

Dr. Baur, of Tübingen, is equally unsuccessful; but the explanation afforded by Dr. Kuhn, in the excellent periodical already referred to, is at once simple and complete.

It will be recollected, as a part of the system attributed to Callistus in the *Philosophumena*, that, in explaining how “the Spirit (*πνεῦμα*) which was Incarnate in the Virgin was not different from the Father,” (by which Callistus merely meant that it was the same Divine Nature), Hippolytus goes on to say that, according to Callistus, in the Incarnate, “that which was seen, that is to say, the Man, was the Son, but the Spirit which was contained in the Son was the Father.” Now in the absence of all confirmation of such a notion, which is otherwise inconsistent with the rest of the views of Callistus, we may easily believe that it is but one of the many glosses in which this intemperate declamation abounds; but it at least explains in what sense Callistus is charged with the error of Theodotus. Not only is not the Word called the Son, anterior to the Incarnation; but, even after the Incarnation, the name Son is given not to the indwelling Divinity, but to the Man Christ. Hence, in the system of Callistus as thus explained, although the Divinity dwells in Him, nevertheless, Christ, the Son, is a mere man:—which so far at least, was precisely the error of Theodotus.

It is highly probable that this perversion of the meaning of Pope Callistus arose out of some of the answers which he may be supposed to have given to the passages from Scripture urged in favour of the qualified subordinatianism which the party of Hippolytus seemed to advocate—passages which Callistus (as did the later Fathers, in the Arian controversy,) must be believed to have interpreted of the human nature of our Lord. For an adversary at once so captious and so impetuous as Hippolytus, this would supply quite sufficient grounds for the imputation.

An equally palpable perversion is discoverable in the Sabellian construction which Hippolytus puts on that declaration of Pope Zephyrinus, which he ascribes to the influence of Callistus.—“I know one God, Christ Jesus, and beside Him I know none, who was born and suffered.” This sentence, it is hardly necessary to say, is in its terms so strictly orthodox, that it is difficult at first sight to understand how any error could be attributed to it. Nevertheless we know that the Noetian and Sabellian party were in the

habit of concealing under this seemingly catholic form their Monarchian principle,—viz., that *beside the Divine Person who suffered, there was no other Divine Person*. So far, however, was this from being the natural and ordinary use of the formulary, that, on the contrary, as is well observed by Dr. Döllinger, it is the very formulary which would first present itself to every Christian; and was, in truth, the favourite profession of the martyrs when called by the heathen to declare what God they worshipped. It is only the extreme of partisanship, in truth, that could represent it, as Hippolytus does, as the shibboleth of heresy, and could draw an argument from the fact that Pope Zephyrinus employed it, in order to show that Pope Callistus was a concealed Sabellian.

In the same way it is not improbable that the imputation of his having taught that the Father suffered *with the Son*, grew out of a simple assertion, on his part, of the perfect identity of the Divine Nature in both these Divine Persons; or perhaps out of the doctrine of the *circuminsession* (περιχωρησις) of the Divine Persons, which is familiar to every student of the fathers of the Nicene period; and which, in truth, is the necessary complement of the orthodox belief of the unity of substance. That he cannot have meant it in the sense of Sabellius, or even of Praxeas and his followers, against whom Tertullian argues,* is evident from his disclaiming, even according to Hippolytus's admission, that the Father suffered. For, to use Tertullian's argument, if he disclaimed the idea of passibility altogether in reference to the Father, he must have equally disclaimed the idea of compassibility. For, as Tertullian acutely observes, "quid est compati, nisi cum alio pati? Porro si impassibilis Pater, utique et incompassibilis."

For an adversary, however, so earnest in making a case, the very notion of the complete identity of substance, and especially when applied to the explanation of this obscure relation of the mystery by the doctrine of the περιχωρησις, may well be believed a sufficient and more than sufficient ground for the imputation.

All this receives a very curious confirmation from the perfectly analogous case of the controversy which arose in Egypt about fifty years later, and which has become

* *Adversus Praxeam*, c. 29, II. 206. Semler's Edit.

celebrated in consequence of the accusation preferred, in relation to it, against Dionysius of Alexandria, before his namesake and contemporary of Rome. It would be interesting, if space permitted, to trace the analogy. It will be enough to say that, in the conflict with the Egyptian Sabellianism, Dionysius of Alexandria appears to have used language similar to that employed by Hippolytus in the same contest at Rome; and he was charged before Dionysius of Rome as falling, through zeal against the Monarchian doctrine, into the opposite extreme of subordinationism. And, among the many remarkable evidences of the fidelity with which Rome has ever guarded the deposit of faith, there is none more interesting to the theological student of history than the accuracy with which the Roman Dionysius drew the line between the monarchianism which he, as well as his Alexandrian brother, repudiated, and that lowering of the relation of the Son to the Father into which the Alexandrian Patriarch had been charged with falling. St. Athanasius, in his Defence of the Nicene Definition, has preserved this document, the exposition of Dionysius of Rome,—in which he remarks upon and refutes those errors against the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity, which exaggerate the distinction of personality into a form inconsistent with the Unity of substance; or which, in effect, represent the nature of the Son as inferior to that of the Father, by using language in reference to His generation, or to His subordination to the Father, which necessarily leads to the inference that He is a work or a creature of the Father. “Next,” says he, “I turn to those who divide and cut into pieces and destroy that most sacred doctrine of the Church of God, the Divine Monarchy, making it certain three powers and partitive subsistences and godheads three. I am told that some among you who are catechists and teachers of the Divine Word, *take the lead in this tenet, who are diametrically opposed, so to speak, to Sabellius’s opinions*; for he blasphemously says that the Son is the Father, and the Father the Son; but they in some sort *preach three Gods*, as dividing the Holy Unity into three subsistences foreign to each other and utterly separate. For it must needs be that with the God of the Universe, the Divine Word is one; and the Holy Ghost must repose and habitate in God; thus in one as in a Summit, I mean the God of the Universe, must the Divine Trinity be gathered up and brought

together. For it is the doctrine of the presumptuous Marcion, to sever and divide the Divine Monarchy into three origins,—a devil's teaching, not that of Christ's true disciples and lovers of the Saviour's lessons. For they know well that a Trinity is preached by Divine Scripture, but that neither Old Testament nor New preaches three Gods.

“Equally must one censure those who hold the Son to be a work, and consider that the Lord has come into being, as one of the things which really came to be; whereas the divine oracles witness to a generation suitable to Him and becoming, but not to any fashioning or making. A blasphemy then is it, not ordinary, but even the highest, to say that the Lord is in any sort a handiwork. For, if He came to be Son, once He was not; but He was always, if (that is) He be in the Father, as He says Himself, and if the Christ be Word and Wisdom and Power, (which, as ye know, Divine Scripture says,) and these attributes be powers of God. If then the Son, came into being once, these attributes were not; consequently there was a time when God was without them; which is most extravagant.”

He sums up his judgment on the whole question as follows:

“Neither then may we divide into three Godheads the wonderful and Divine Unity; nor disparage with the name of ‘work’ the dignity and exceeding majesty of the Lord; but we must believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Christ Jesus His Son, and in the Holy Ghost, and hold that to the God of the Universe the Word is united. ‘For I,’ says He, ‘and the Father are one;’ and, ‘I in the Father and the Father in Me.’ For thus, both the Divine Trinity, and the holy preaching of the Monarchy, will be preserved.”*

St. Athanasius, in speaking of the expressions of Dionysius of Alexandria, which led to his being accused at Rome of heterodoxy, explicitly attributes his using such language as led to these accusations to his being engaged in argument against the Sabellians. “Dionysius, who was bishop of Alexandria,” he says, “upon his writings against Sabellius, and expounding at large the Saviour's

* Oxford Translation. Part I. pp. 45-7.

economy, according to the flesh, and therein proving against the Sabellians, that not the Father, but the Word was made Fesh, as John has said, was suspected of saying that the Word was a thing made and generated, and not one in substance with the Father; on which he wrote to his namesake, Dionysius, Bishop of Rome, to explain that this was a slander upon him.*

In like manner St. Basil, who admits the faultiness of the language of Dionysius, ascribes it to the same cause—a zeal against Sabellianism running into the opposite extreme.†

It is a very remarkable confirmation of the view we have suggested, that we find precisely the same series of events that befel in the days of Pope Callistus, re-enacted in the same controversy when it arose half a century later, in a different part of the Church, but between the same classes of adversaries. We find at Alexandria, as at Rome, two different courses taken in the contest with Sabellianism—the one adopted by Dionysius, the other by those who charged Dionysius with heterodoxy. Now, their charges against Dionysius tally most strikingly with those which we learn from Hippolytus, were made against him by Callistus, and those who joined with him. The first part of the extract from Dionysius, of Rome, given above, reveals to us precisely the same imputation of “Ditheism,” of which Hippolytus complained so bitterly; the second points with equal distinctness to the temporary generation of the Word, and the subordination of the Word to the Father, which are ascribed to Hippolytus. If Pope Callistus had been equally fortunate with his successor Dionysius; and if we possessed any writing of his own, explanatory of his own opinions, and of his objections to the teaching of Hippolytus against Sabellius, as well as of the grounds of those objections; there can be no possible doubt that that explanation would be identical in doctrine, in spirit, and in phraseology, with the Letter of Pope Dionysius, which, thanks to its having been used in argument by Athanasius, has escaped the fate of almost all the other literary remains of the early Papacy.


It is time, however, to close this long and disjointed

* Oxford Translation, p. 44.

† Ep. 41. Petavius. De Trinitate, ii. 27.

controversy. What has been said already may satisfy even the most sensitive client of the papacy, that, like every similar attempt in the earlier history of the struggle, the effort to call forth Pope Callistus from the obscurity in which he had hitherto lain, for the purpose of representing him, not as a saint and a guardian of orthodoxy, but as a corrupt ruler of the Church and a heretical teacher, has proved a complete failure. It is only by a hasty and uncritical acceptance of the statement of one who was avowedly the adversary of the Pontiff, and whom the very slightest examination would have proved to be himself in the wrong, that the case against him could have obtained even a temporary currency. A more careful enquiry shows him forth in the true light in which all history represents his fellow successor of St. Peter—as the guardian of the faith of the Church; the steady defender of the letter of its theological language; and the uncompromising antagonist of every new form of words, however specious in itself, or estimable from the learning and zeal of its author. It shows him forth as clinging to that just mean between the opposite extremes into which error has so often run—the mean which it has been the historical privilege of Rome to maintain—the mean which Innocent held between Fatalism and Pelagianism,—which Leo held between Nestorius and Eutyches; and by maintaining which, Rome, forfeiting for nearly half a century the favour of the emperor and the communion of his Patriarchs, in the end saved the East to the Church;—the mean by which, in the controversy of the Three Chapters, the Popes once more preserved, almost in its own despite, the orthodoxy of the West;—the mean again between Idolatry and Iconoclasm, which, while it protected the noblest conceptions of the Nature of the Divinity, secured for weak humanity one of the best and most precious supports of its weakness in the struggle towards the higher life;—the unfailing, unchanging mean, in fine, the adhesion to which is the secret at once of the greatness and the humility of

That Crown august, which, like a star,
O'er all things and through all things shone,
Was regal, feudal, popular,
Was friend to each, and slave to none.



ART. VI.—1. *Allocutio Sanctissimi Domini Nostri Pii PP. IX.* Allocution of His Holiness Pius IX., in the Consistory of November 3, 1855.*

2. *Lingard.* Observations on the Laws and Ordinances of Foreign States, published in 1817. (Now printed with his Tracts.)

IN our last number we had occasion to discuss the right of a nation to alter, upon the ground of internal change in its government and constitution, stipulations guaranteed by solemn treaties with the Holy See. Whilst the politicians of one kingdom were endeavouring to justify want of faith with the Church, the statesmen of Austria were anxious to repair the evil and undo the wrong, which a similar spirit of resistance to her authority had effected and had maintained for more than seventy years. Scarcely had the troubles of the first years of his reign subsided, when the youthful Emperor turned his attention to the restraints imposed upon the Church by his predecessors; and amidst the anxieties of his position during the war, which is engaging the Northern and Western States, he has never wavered in his wish to fulfil that duty of justice to the Church, without which, justice to his allies and to his subjects would never be secured.

The task was a difficult one. Whilst Calvin gave the right of holding spiritual power to the body of the faithful, the courtly Luther claimed it for their rulers only, and Grotius allowed the Church to exercise it by delegation from them. The Emperor Joseph II. was willing to act upon views so favourable to his authority, and yet was unwilling to lose the honour of being a son of the Church. The same views found favour with our Tudor kings, and have been always welcome to the pride of sovereigns and to the ambition of parliaments. But others were content to assert them in measures of ecclesiastical government; Joseph claimed the supremacy of the Crown, and employed

* At the time when this paper was sent to press, only the first of the lectures of His Eminence Cardinal Wiseman on the Concordat had been published.

its power in managing the administration of a sacristy as well as in checking the authority of bishops, and in measuring the action of their clergy. He was weary of the regulations which had for centuries preserved harmony between the Church and State in the empire over which he held dominion. "Possessed with the mania of innovation, and conceiving that every obstacle must yield to his imperial authority, he formed the most visionary schemes, and pursued them with a pertinacity bordering upon madness. His experiments extended to everything; to the law, to the army, to the Church, and the constitutions of the provincial states. He consulted neither the opinions nor the feelings of his subjects. Institutions the most ancient, and most sacred, confirmed by treaties and charters, were swept away; every remaining vestige of the liberty of former times was abolished; and decrees on all kinds of subjects, sometimes indeed salutary, sometimes absurd and impious, were issued in rapid succession. Irritated by the opposition of the clergy, he conceived, in 1785, the idea of separating his dominions from the communion of the Church of Rome. It was the Chevalier Azara, the Spanish minister at the Papal Court, who convinced him that his subjects were not yet ripe for such a measure. He therefore reverted to his plans of reform, and continued to encroach on the spiritual authority of the bishops. It was in vain that the prelates of Austria, of Hungary, of Bohemia, of Germany, of the Netherlands, protested against them. The remonstrances were treated with contempt; the disobedience of some was punished with fines, of others with exile. Many lost, with part of their dioceses, the greater portion of their incomes; and all were stripped of the situations which they held in the provincial states. At length, the effect of his innovations, civil and religious, recoiled upon himself. Austria was in a ferment: Hungary was on the point of insurrection: the Netherlands had revolted and established their independence, when his death opportunely saved the monarchy. Whilst Joseph was acting in this manner, his brother Leopold was Grand Duke of Tuscany. Guided, perhaps driven by the Emperor, he pursued a similar course, and was aided by the counsels of Ricci, Bishop of Pistoia. The same edicts were published by the Tuscan government, and equal opposition was made by the Tuscan bishops."—(*Lingard.*)

Emperors more ambitious than Joseph and Leopold had occupied the throne of the Cæsars, and some of them had been passive whilst the peaceful sway of the Church was invaded ; but none of them had adopted the dangerous and illegal course of usurping her place, and of directing the consciences of their subjects. The Josephine and Leopoldine laws were guided by a wish to extend the dominion of the Crown by encroachments upon the immunities of the Church, and by endeavours to alter the discipline, which, in former times, had been considered sacred. At the Congress of Ems, and in the Synod of Pistoia, attempts were made to secure the concurrence of the pastors of the Church in these disastrous innovations ; and writers of the Febronian school were ready to justify them by pretended reference to primitive discipline. The enactments of the rulers were too faithfully carried out by the numerous *employés*, who felt that it was for their own interest to develop the principles embodied in them, and to render the administration of the laws themselves cumbersome and complicated.

Against a system thus framed and thus administered it is difficult to struggle. In vain had the venerable Pius VI. merited the name assigned to him in the fanciful prophecy, which has given titles to successive popes, by travelling, a true *peregrinus apostolicus*, to Vienna, where Joseph idly strove to conceal the settled purpose of his mind under acts of courtesy to his illustrious guest. In vain had other pontiffs sought to break the web of that ever-renewing legislation ; and in vain had the bishops of Austria and Lombardy represented the afflictions of their churches to their sovereigns. The successor of Theodosius would not listen to the prayer of the successor of St. Ambrose ; and bishops, whose sees had been founded by St. Stephen, wasted their time in appeals to the kings of Hungary. Even the French revolution, which swept away the old form of government, left unalloyed the craft and worldly cunning of the Josephine legislation ; and some of the worst features of the republican laws of France against the Church were borrowed from it.

A hasty review of the provisions of the new Concordat will convince any impartial reader that the evils must have been real and deep-rooted against which they are directed. So far from thinking that the Holy See has entrenched upon the rights of the Crown, he will be surprised at the

usurpation of the spiritual rights and of the sacred authority of the Church which this treaty is intended to correct. Leaving, therefore, to the eminent Prelate, who has commenced the defence of the Concordat, the fulfilment of the duty which he has undertaken, and which he is so fully qualified to perform, we beg to confine ourselves to an account of its provisions, with a few brief notes, by which our readers may be enabled to understand their object, and the magnitude of the wrong of which the Austrian legislation has so long been the instrument.

“ I. The Catholic, Roman Apostolic Religion shall ever be maintained in all its integrity in the Empire of Austria, and in all its dependencies, with all those rights and prerogatives which, by the ordinance of God and the disposition of the Canons it ought to enjoy.”

It was only reasonable to suppose, as a basis of the Concordat, the provision, that the Catholic Church should be protected in the Austrian dominions, with the prerogatives and rights which are derived from the laws of God and from the Canons. A similar provision, as Mr. Bowyer has remarked, in his able replies to Dr. Cumming, is contained in the first article of Magna Charta.

“ II. As the Roman Pontiff has by Divine right the primacy of honour and jurisdiction throughout the whole Church, the mutual communication between the Bishops, the Clergy, the people and the Holy See, in spiritual and ecclesiastical matters, shall be subject to no necessity of obtaining the *placetum regium*, but shall be completely free.”

The right, bestowed by our divine Lord upon St. Peter and his successors, is here described almost in the words of the Council of Florence ; “ *Definimus Romano pontifici in B. Petro pascendi, regendi et gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam a Domino nostro Jesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse.*” For its fair and full exercise, communication between the Pope and all his children is surely necessary ; and it is humiliating to think that the freedom, which is essential to it, and the effect of the decrees of the Holy See should have been restrained by the laws which required the *placet*.

“ By the *placet*,” says Dr. Lingard, “ is understood a custom prevailing in many states, according to which papal bulls and briefs are subjected to the inspection of the civil

power before they are permitted to be carried into execution. From the word by which the assent of the sovereign is signified, it is called the *placet*, *pareatis*, or *exequatur*." The *placet* was introduced in the middle ages, and in our own legislation was represented by the statutes of provisors and *premunire*. Whilst Catholics have always and with reason objected to it, various questions have been raised amongst those who are favourable to it, as to the extent to which the inspection may be carried. In the seventeenth century an attempt was made by the supreme Council of Brabant to resist the bull of Urban VIII., condemning the heresy of Jansenius, on the ground that the *placet* had not been attached to it. This was the first instance of an attempt to subject doctrinal decisions to its operation. Similar efforts were made by the Crown in France in the course of that and the following century; in Spain in 1761, and by Joseph II. in 1781. But the clergy everywhere resisted them, and even Joseph found it necessary, in 1782, to modify his decree by declaring, that "it must be evident that doctrinal bulls were made subject to the royal inspection only inasmuch as might be necessary to ascertain that they were merely doctrinal, and did not contain any incompetent article."—Lingard, p. 475.

Although in France a different notion prevailed, it is asserted that, in general, grants which had no external influence and which interested only the consciences of individuals, were never interfered with. But, when a brief or rescript contained a provision on beneficiary or litigated matters, the Josephine laws claimed authority to inspect and pass them; and, in the extension of those laws to other states, finance ministers soon discovered that fees might be demanded from the parties, and might form an important source of revenue. Thus the *placet* was maintained by the wish of sovereigns to uphold an assumed right; was stretched by the ingenuity of officials; and was eagerly supported by the avarice of the royal exchequer.

The evils of the system upon which the *placet* was defended cannot be sufficiently deplored. In some kingdoms the opposition of the state to the ecclesiastics named to vacant benefices by the Holy See, lessened the number of learned ecclesiastics, and filled their places with ignorant men. Without denying the Popes' right to appoint their subjects to benefices in their states, or to determine points of canon law arising out of the existence of such benefices,

sovereigns introduced the anomaly of committing to lay and incompetent examiners the consideration of the document conveying the papal concession or judgment, and of allowing them to stay nominations and impede the course of justice, not only to the detriment of suitors, but to the injury of the flock over which those suitors were to preside.

We have had, within the last three years, an instance of an archbishop kept from his Cathedral and See by the annoying checks of the system upon which the *Placet* is based. To such lengths has this prerogative been extended, that we have known delay in foreign states in the publication of the bulls of canonization of the Five Saints decreed by Gregory XVI. in 1839; and petitions for new festivals have been met by doubts of the necessity of the *Placet*. In the regulations of the Gallican Church appended to the Concordat between Pius VII. and Buonaparte, may be read these astounding propositions: "The decrees of foreign synods, or even of general councils, shall not be published in France before the government shall have examined their form, their conformity to the laws, rights, and privileges of the French republic; no bull, rescript &c., nor other missive from the Court of Rome, even though it should relate to individuals only, shall be received, published, printed, or otherwise put in force, without the authority of government: no council or diocesan synod, no deliberative assembly, shall be held without the express sanction of government." (*Concordat*, p. 5, Dublin, 1802).

The Emperor of Austria has wisely abandoned claims so dangerous to justice and to religion, and so hostile to the divine authority of the Holy See.

"III. Archbishops and Bishops, and all Ordinaries shall have free communication with the clergy and the inhabitants of their diocese, and freely perform their pastoral duties. They will also be free to issue instructions and ordinances on clerical matters."

"IV. They will also be at liberty to do everything belonging to the government of their Sees, which is in accordance with the canons and present discipline of the Church, as approved by the Holy See."

Even in protestant kingdoms it would scarcely have been deemed necessary to stipulate for freedom to exercise the episcopal authority and to conduct the administration of dioceses according to the discipline of the Church; and yet, so complete was the thralldom established by the

Josephine laws, that it was found necessary to lay down these preliminary propositions, and even to specify the points upon which government interference was to be abandoned. Thus, it is provided: (a) that bishops are to choose their own advisers and vicars; (b) to ordain those whom they consider qualified, and to refuse to ordain those whom they consider unworthy; (c) to establish smaller livings, and, after having come to an understanding with the government, especially for the assignment of sufficient revenues, to erect or divide parishes; (d) to order public prayers, thanksgivings, and pilgrimages, and arrange funerals according to the canons; (e) to convoke synods, and publish their enactments.

It will scarcely be believed that in some states, where the Leopoldine or Josephine laws prevail, bishops cannot issue the dispensations from abstinence in Lent without the *visa* of a public officer, and that they are sometimes obliged by their aversion to his interference, to withhold them.

“V. The whole course of instruction of Catholic youth to be in strict accordance with the doctrines of the Catholic religion, as well in private as in public schools; and the Bishops, in virtue of their pastoral office, will superintend the religious education of young people in all public and private schools, and will take the greatest care that nothing shall be introduced into the course of instruction which is opposed to Catholic faith and strict morality.”

The principle of this provision is admitted by our own legislature, which disclaims any interference with the religious instruction of catholic children in schools supported at the public expense, and recognises in their clergy, the latter being, of course, directed by their superiors, and guided by the teaching of the Church, the right to train them in accordance with her holy doctrines.

“VI. No one can teach sacred theology, catechism, or the doctrines of the Church, in any public or private institution, if he has not received from the Bishop of the diocese both mission and authority, which can be recalled if it should be considered necessary. The public professors of theology and the teachers of catechism will be chosen from those candidates whom the Bishop, after having examined into their faith, piety, and knowledge, is willing to intrust with the mission and powers to instruct. But where doctors of the theological faculty are employed by the Bishops to teach theology to the pupils of the episcopal seminary, only those

men shall be advanced to that degree whom the Bishop shall find particularly fitting for such an office. At the examination of those persons who are preparing to take their degree as Doctors of Theology or of Canonical Law, half of the examiners will be chosen by the Bishop from the ranks of the Doctors of Theology or of Canonical Law."

When Joseph experienced opposition to his measures, he adopted the idea of "new-modelling the education of the clergy. With this view, he dissolved the universities; abolished the episcopal seminaries, in which the candidates for holy orders were educated under the eye of their respective prelates; and established general seminaries, to which every bishop was ordered to send the young clergymen of his diocese. The professors in the new schools were appointed by the emperor himself; and the theology which was taught, was accommodated to his opinions and ordinances. Their chief authority was the Belgian canonist, Van Espen, who had been accused of having, to favour his friends the Jansenists, exalted the jurisdiction of the crown by the depression of that of the Church; but they pushed his principles to their utmost extent, and drew from them conclusions which he had not admitted. It is to this new school that we owe the work of Rechberger, and other publications." (*Lingard*, p. 455.)

These attempts of the emperor to transfer the whole education of the clergy to professors chosen by himself, met with strenuous opposition in Belgium. The leader and champion of the faithful in that portion of his dominions, was the celebrated Cardinal de Frankenberg, archbishop of Mechlin, and he was vigorously supported by the clergy and every order in the state. In their addresses, each and all declared that the commission to teach all nations, given by Our Divine Lord to His Apostles, and through them to the bishops of the Church, necessarily implied that the right to form, and instruct, and commission those who were to announce His doctrine, was intended to be given to the bishops, and could not lawfully be claimed by the civil power. The stern determination of the Belgian people to uphold this right is strikingly displayed in the history of the last years of the emperor's reign, recorded in Theiner's life of Cardinal Frankenberg.

This sixth paragraph of the Concordat reserves the examination of candidates for theological chairs in public and private institutions to the bishop, and those

only are to be appointed whom he may be willing to invest with authority to teach Theology; in the choice of professors for the episcopal seminaries, the candidate, whom the bishop considers most qualified is to be preferred.

As we do not think that any one will question the propriety of entrusting the examination of theological professors to the bishops, and as the two next paragraphs chiefly regard public establishments, and middle and elementary schools for Catholics; we need not trouble the reader with any remarks upon them.

“VII. In the *gymnasia* or middle class schools for the Catholic youth, only Catholic professors or teachers can be appointed, and the tuition must, in proportion to the object taught, tend to engrave the laws of Christian life on the hearts of the students. The Bishops will, after having consulted with each other, settle what religious books are to be employed in the above mentioned schools. The wholesome ordinances which have already been issued in respect to the appointment of teachers of religion for *gymnasia* and middle class schools will be maintained.

“VIII. All teachers appointed for public schools intended for Catholics will be under ecclesiastical superintendence. His Majesty will appoint the chief inspector of the schools of the diocese from among the individuals proposed by each Bishop. In case proper provision have not been paid to the instruction in religion in these schools, the Bishops shall be at liberty to appoint a Priest to teach the Catechism to the pupils. The faith and morality of the person to be appointed as teacher in a school must be blameless. He who errs from the right path will be removed from his post.”

The next paragraph has been the subject of much angry comment.

“IX. Archbishops, Bishops, and all ordinaries will freely exercise the power they possess to censure books which are injurious to religion and morality, and to keep the Faithful from reading them. The Government will take the proper measures for keeping such books from being spread over the empire.”

The Church, guarding anxiously the sacred deposit of Truth, and knowing how fatal is the poison which the flock may find in pastures not chosen by herself, asks in this paragraph the help of the state to prevent the dissemination of books injurious to religion and morality. Her pastors assert their inherent right to point out these books, and to keep the faithful from reading them; and who will

gainsay this right or question the necessity, which every government admits, of an authority in every kingdom armed with sufficient power to prevent or check the publication of dangerous books? Whether that power be exercised, as in Austria, with the advice of the Church, or by punishment inflicted upon the authors of libellous, seditious, or irreligious books, as in England, the principle of a censorship over the press, is everywhere the same; although we must confess that if the prevention of crime be better than its punishment, the advantage is on the side of the Austrian plan, which takes notice of dangerous books before they have been extensively read; whereas by the English rule you are bound to wait until the tendency of a book is known by the mischief wrought by it, and until, as has often happened in the case of libels, public sympathy has been enlisted in favour of their author.

“ X. As all ecclesiastical processes, and particularly those which have reference to faith, the Sacraments, the sacred functions, and obligations and rights connected with the priesthood, belong exclusively to the Church's courts, in such cases the ecclesiastical judge will give sentence. The latter has also in questions of marriage to decide according to the Sacred Canons, and particularly according to the ordinances of the Council of Trent, and only to refer the civil consequences arising from marriage to the temporal judge. In regard to betrothments, (*sponsalia quod attinet*) the spiritual power will decide on their existence and in how far they can be made impediments to marriage, according to the ordinances of the Council of Trent and the Apostolical Letters, beginning, ‘*Auctorem Fidei.*’ ”

The right of the Church to decide matters affecting faith and other spiritual causes was upheld by the glorious martyr St. Thomas of Canterbury; and amidst all the changes of our laws and institutions, is still recognized in the very constitution of the English courts. Amongst ecclesiastical causes none can more truly belong to the spiritual judge than those which affect the Sacrament of Matrimony.

The assertion of the Synod of Pistoia (1786) that the promise of marriage known to theologians under the name of *sponsalia*, was a mere civil act preparatory to the celebration of marriage, and wholly subject to the law of the state, had been formally censured by Pius VI. in the Dogmatical Bull “*Auctorem Fidei*,” and is in this paragraph rejected by the Austrian government.

We are glad to learn that the Grand Duke of Modena has already adopted in his states the provisions contained in this paragraph, and has annulled the law prescribing the civil marriage, instead of marriage duly contracted before the Church. Prince Metternich always contended that the Austrian legislation on this subject ought to be conformable to the Council of Trent. By this paragraph of the Concordat, all questions of the validity of marriage are to be determined by the law of the Council; and consequently, the erroneous notion is abandoned that the authority of the state is equal or superior to the inherent and divine right of the Church to constitute impediments which prohibit and invalidate marriages in certain cases. Thus, the claim is rejected, which sovereigns have sometimes advanced, to declare marriages null when they have been contracted against the will of the parents of the parties; or to render void the decree of the Council by substituting the presence of the civil officer for the presence of the parish priest and witnesses, thereby disregarding the impediment of clandestinity established by the Council.

With the exception of the paragraph in which the authority of the bishops to punish the transgression of the laws of the Church by spiritual censures is asserted, we do not think that the following sections will be objected to even by the most prejudiced readers; and if they will recollect that the use of excommunication is still preserved in the Protestant ecclesiastical courts of this kingdom, they will not blame the Austrian government for leaving the authority to inflict censures undisturbed. Spiritual censures are the only remedies that remain after entreaty and remonstrance have failed to correct public and open disobedience to the laws of God and of His Church; and no one can forget the sentence pronounced against all who refuse to hear her voice; and that in that divine sanction is promised a confirmation of the censures which she may be obliged to inflict. It is idle to blame the use of censures, if they are but an empty ceremony; it is wicked² to oppose that use, if they possess a supernatural and divine sanction.

“XI. The Bishops will be at liberty to inflict on the clergy who do not wear the becoming dress in keeping with their order and dignity, or are guilty of any other offence, the punishments appointed by the Sacred Canons or such others as the Bishops may

think fit, and to keep them to monasteries, seminaries, or in other houses destined for the purpose. Neither shall the Bishops in any way be impeded in the infliction of ecclesiastical censures on any of the Faithful who offend against the laws and canons of the Church.

“XII. The spiritual courts will decide as to right of patronage, but the Holy See consents, when it is the question of a temporal right of patronage, that the civil courts may decide on the succession to the right of patronage, whether the dispute be between the true and pretended patrons, or between the ecclesiastics who may have been appointed to the livings by those patrons.

“XIII. In consideration of the times the Holy See consents that the purely temporal affairs of the clergy—such as right of property, debts, and inheritances—shall be examined into and decided on in temporal courts.

“XIV. For this same reason the Papal Chair will not prevent (*haud impedit*) Priests who have been guilty of crimes or other offences against the criminal code of the empire being brought before a temporal court; but the latter is bound immediately to inform the Bishop of what has occurred. When the criminal is arrested, and during his confinement, he shall be treated with that consideration which a proper respect for the clerical profession demands. If the sentence passed on a priest is that of death or of imprisonment for more than five years, the proceedings are always to be made known to the bishop, in order that he may be able to examine the criminal and know what clerical punishment to inflict on him. If the sentence is less heavy, the same proceedings must be observed, should the Bishop require it. Priests shall always be imprisoned in places where they are separated from secular delinquents. In case a priest is sentenced to imprisonment for a crime or misdemeanor. (*ex delicto vel transgressione*,) he shall be confined in a monastery or other ecclesiastical house. In the conditions of this article those greater causes to which reference is made in the 24th session of the Council of Trent are in no way included. For the treatment of those cases provision will, if necessary, be made by His Holiness and His Imperial Majesty.”

Although our own legislature has abolished the ancient laws of sanctuary, the sacredness of places of worship is still asserted in our laws. The most barbarous nations, as well as the most civilized, understand the appeal that is made to their best and highest feelings, by those who have sought refuge in a temple or a church. A gallant officer, whose untimely death has deprived his queen of a faithful and brave man, rejoiced that in his memorable expeditions in the White Sea, and in the Sea of Azoff, he had not allowed his cannon to fire upon the churches.

“XV. In order that proper respect shall be shown to the house of God, the King of kings, and the Lord of lords, the immunity of the churches shall be maintained in as far as public safety and the claims of justice shall permit.”

The next paragraph needs no remark, as most of those who are opposed to our holy faith would restrain blasphemous attacks upon its mysteries, and concur in repressing insults to its ministers.

“XVI. His Majesty the Emperor will not allow (*non patietur*) the Catholic Church and its Faith, its liturgy, and its institutions to be contemned by word, deed, or writing, or its dignitaries or ministers to be impeded in the practice of their duties, particularly when it is the question of the custody of the Faith, of the laws of morality, or of the discipline of the Church. In case of need he will give efficacious assistance, in order that the sentence which the Bishop may pronounce against clerics oblivious of their duties may be put into execution. As it is his will that the servants of the sanctuary should receive the honour which, by the divine law, belongs to them, he will not permit anything to be done which could disgrace or bring them into contempt; on the contrary, he will issue his commands that all the authorities in the Empire shall on all occasions exhibit the reverence and respect which is due not only to the Archbishops or Bishops, but to the Clergy.”

In addition to the universities, in which the higher branches of learning are cultivated, the Church has earnestly commended to her Pastors the duty of founding Seminaries, in which youths destined for the sacred ministry are fostered and trained under the eye of the bishop, whom they are to assist in the care of his portion of the Lord's vineyard.

“XVII. The episcopal seminaries are to be maintained; and where the endowment is insufficient for the object for which they, by the holy Council of Trent, were intended, the deficiency will be properly provided for. The Bishops have the full and free right to conduct and manage them (the seminaries) according to the rules laid down in the Sacred Canons. They will therefore appoint the directors and professors or teachers of the seminaries in question, and whenever they consider it necessary or advantageous, may dismiss them. They can also receive youths and boys into them for education as they may deem it advantageous in the Lord. The persons who have been educated in these seminaries will, after a previous examination as to their capacity, be at liberty to enter any and every educational institution, and may,

due observance being paid to the appointed regulations, enter into competition for any chair (*cathedra*) out of the seminary."

The eighteenth paragraph admits the right of the Holy See to make territorial divisions, and fix the boundaries of dioceses. The same right was exercised at the request of Napoleon in the circumscription and erection of Sees in the provinces of France, Belgium, and the Rhine, in 1801, and has been fully admitted by the government of Holland, since the restoration of the Hierarchy in that kingdom.

The nineteenth paragraph confirms the excellent rule of the Imperial Court, of asking the advice of the bishops of the province concerned, and of other bishops before proposing candidates for vacant dioceses to the Holy See.

The next paragraph contains the oath of allegiance which bishops are to take at the time of their nomination. In the consecration oath, which is taken by bishops in the British dominions, it is expressly stated that the bishop elect willingly makes the promises contained in it, because he knows they are in complete accordance with his allegiance to Her Majesty and her successors.

"XVIII. The Holy See, in virtue of its right, shall form new Sees or change the boundaries of those already existing, should the spiritual welfare of the Faithful render it necessary; but in such cases it will enter into communication with the Imperial Government.

"XIX. His Imperial Majesty, in the choice of the Bishops whom he proposes or appoints, in virtue of an apostolic privilege (*privilegi apostolici*) granted by the Holy See to his most illustrious ancestors, will continue to take the advice of the Bishops, and particularly those of the province concerned.

"XX. The Metropolitans and Bishops, before they undertake the government of their churches, shall, in the presence of His Imperial Majesty, take the oath of fidelity, in the following words;—'I swear and promise on God's holy Gospels—as it beseems a Bishop—obedience and fidelity to your Imperial, Royal, Apostolic Majesty and to your illustrious successors. Also, I swear and promise not to share in any communications or councils which could endanger the public peace, and not to maintain any suspicious connections either within or without the frontiers of the empire; and if I should learn anything that could bring danger to the State, to neglect nothing which could avert it.'

"XXI. In all parts of the empire all Archbishops, Bishops, and Priests shall be at liberty to dispose, according to the Sacred

Canons, of the property of which they may be possessed at the time of their death, and the conditions of the same are to be exactly observed by the lawful heirs, who may take possession of the heritage without testamentary directions. In either case the episcopal insignia and the episcopal vestments of diocesan prelates shall always be excepted, as they are considered the property of the See, and devolve on the Bishops who succeed. The same exception will be made in respect to the books, where such has become the custom (*ubi usu receptum est.*")

The twenty-second and twenty-third paragraphs explain the way of filling up vacant benefices, and of providing, where they are wanting, for the nomination of the Canon Theologian, and of the Canon Penitentiary. The former is charged by the S. Council of Trent, (Sess. v. c. i.) with the duty of lecturing upon the Scripture, and the latter, as his name implies, is bound to hear confessions at stated times, and holds spiritual jurisdiction *de jure* in right of his office.

" XXII. His Holiness appoints the first dignitary (*primam dignitatem*) in all metropolitan, archiepiscopal, and suffragan churches, except when they are dependant on a private secular right of presentation, in which case His Holiness will nominate the second. His Majesty will continue to appoint the other dignitaries and canonical prebendaries, excepting those whom the Bishops have a free right to nominate, or where there is a legitimate advowson. Only those Priests can become Deans who possess the qualities prescribed by the Canonical Laws, and have besides distinguished themselves in their pastoral duties, in the business of the Church, or as teachers of theology. The necessity for noble birth or titles of nobility is done away with, saving the conditions laid down in the act of foundation. The praiseworthy custom of filling up canonries by means of public competition will, where it already exists, be strictly adhered to.

" XXIII. In those metropolitan and episcopal churches where they are wanting, the Canon Penitentiary and Theologian will be named as soon as possible, and in the collegiate churches, the Canon Theologian, and that in the way arranged in the 5th and 24th sessions of the Holy Council of Trent. These prebends will be filled up by the Bishops according to the directions given by the above mentioned Council, and by Papal decrees bearing on this matter."

As some discussion has taken place upon the accuracy of the English translation of the Concordat, made by persons unaccustomed to the legal phraseology in which it is written, it may be mentioned that the author of the version

given in the *Times* of November 20, which we have generally followed, has overlooked the technical meaning of the word *dignitas*, which denotes the benefice and honour held by one or more members in a chapter, thence styled *dignitaries*, and has not conveyed the correct meaning of this paragraph. By the fourth rule of the *Regulæ Cancellariæ* the right of appointing to the first dignity in cathedrals is reserved to the Pope (Devoti tit. v. n. 35.); and by the Concordat it is provided that, where this right is vested in a lay patron, the reservation shall apply to the second dignity, the Emperor retaining the power of presenting to the others. The version of the *Times* is as follows:—"His Holiness accords the first rank to all metropolitan, archiepiscopal and suffragan churches, except when they are dependant on a private secular right of presentation, in which case they occupy the second rank." In the last sentence of the paragraph, *canonicatus* is translated, *deanery*.

The next paragraph ordains that the system of selecting parish priests from amongst the best candidates, by means of the *concursum*, before examiners appointed in the Diocesan Synods, is to be in force in all parishes subject to episcopal nomination. In those of lay or royal patronage, three candidates are to be presented by the bishop, and the patron will choose one of their number. (xxv.) Where benefices are attached to the two Funds, styled of religion and education, (see paragraph xxxi.) the emperor is to have the advowson. As the canons require the holding of the *Concursum* soon after the vacancy, we may trust that these clauses will remove the scandal which the Josephine laws have been known to produce in Austrian Italy, where the nomination to parishes has sometimes been delayed for the space of ten or twelve years.

"XXIV. All rectories (*paræciæ*) are to be filled up by means of public competition and agreeably to the directions given by the Council of Trent. In the case of livings with a clerical right of advowson, the patron shall appoint one out of three persons to be chosen by the Bishop in the way above mentioned.

"XXV. In order to give His Apostolic Majesty the Emperor and King Francis Joseph a proof of his singular benevolence (kindly feeling), His Holiness grants to him and to his Catholic successors in the empire, the right of presentation to all canonries and parishes when the advowson is derived from the Religious and Educational Fund, but in such a way that one person must be chosen out of

the three whom the Bishop, after public competition, shall have found more worthy than the others.

“XXVI. The revenues of those parishes of which the *congrua* is not sufficient at the present time, and for the place where they are situated, will as soon as possible be increased, and the Catholic parish priests of the Oriental rite will be cared for in the same way as those who practise the Latin form of worship. But this arrangement does not extend to those livings which are under a clerical or lay patronage canonically acquired, the patrons of such livings having to bear the expenses of the same. If the patrons do not completely fulfil the obligations ordained by the canonical laws, and particularly if the incumbent has to receive his salary from the religious fund, provision will be made with due consideration of the circumstances.”

Every one acquainted with the laws regarding benefices in England will understand the wisdom of the provision which requires canonical institution to livings in Austria.

“XXVII. As the right to the enjoyment of Church property springs from canonical institution, all those persons who may be appointed to or presented with larger or smaller livings will only be able to administer to any property annexed to the same by virtue of the canonical institution. When possession is taken of the cathedrals and of the property attached to them, the conditions of the canonical statutes, and in particular of those prescribed in the Roman Pontifical and Ceremonial, will be strictly observed, and all other usage and custom set aside.”

The next paragraph will tend to counteract some of the worst points in the Josephine legislation. It allows communities to be formed, with the consent of the bishops, of orders not already existing in Austria; and thus the restrictions which have prevented so much good, and have checked so many vocations, will be removed. The Ven. Juvenal Ancina, of the Oratory, Bishop of Saluzzo, the intimate friend of St. Francis de Sales, said that the Church allowed a variety of orders, because of the endless variety of characters and dispositions, which they were to draw to perfection. To accomplish their holy work they must be under their own superiors, and the latter must have free communication with all the houses subject to their authority. Where the civil power has interfered with this freedom, inferiors have lost the spirit of dependence upon their spiritual head, and have been able to perpetuate neglect of religious observance through the influence of the

bureaucracy, which was more willing to sympathize with the subjects of the state, than with their superiors living at a distance, and easily found means to stay the operation of the most salutary ordinances.

“XXVIII. Regulars who, according to the statutes of their order, are subjected to general superiors residing at the Holy See, will be governed by the same, according to those statutes, but without prejudice to the rights which are granted to the Bishops by the canons, and particularly by the Council of Trent. The abovementioned general-superiors shall freely communicate with their subjects on all matters connected with their office, and have the free right of visitation. Further, all religious shall, and that without impediment, observe the rules of the order, institution, or congregation to which they belong, and they shall, according to the directions of the Holy See, admit applicants to make their novitiate and to take the vows. The foregoing, in as far as it is applicable to them, is valid for nuns. The Archbishops and Bishops shall have the power to introduce, according to the canonical laws, clerical orders and congregations of both sexes into their dioceses, but they will have to consult the Imperial Government on the subject.”

The five following clauses secure (a) the right of the Church to acquire property, which the state is to consider sacred; (b) the administration of it; (c) the use to be made of the two funds, styled of religion and education; (d) the transfer of the revenue of vacant benefices in Hungary and other states hitherto held by the crown to the Religious Fund. Lastly, it is provided that where tithes are no longer paid, they shall not be claimed, and that the ecclesiastics entitled to receive them shall be indemnified by government, but with the proviso that the stock granted in lieu of tithes shall be held on the same valid title on which the tithe rested.

“XXIX. The Church shall be entitled to acquire new possessions in every legal way, and the property which it now possesses or may in future acquire shall be inviolable. Neither older nor more recent Ecclesiastical foundations can be done away with or united without the consent of the Holy See, but this without prejudice to the powers granted to the Bishops by the Holy Council of Trent.

“XXX. The administration of the estates of the Church will be cared for by the persons appointed by the canons; but, in consideration of the assistance which His Majesty gives, and will continue to give to the Church out of the public treasury, those

estates shall neither be sold nor burdened to any considerable amount, unless the Holy See and His Majesty the Emperor, or those persons whom they may appoint, shall have given their consent.

“ XXXI. The estates which form the funds denominated of religion and education are, *ab origine*, the property of the Church, and will be managed in the name of the Church, but the Bishops shall have the proper superintendence over them, according to the agreement to be made between the Papal Chair and His Majesty. The revenues of the religious fund will, until that fund has, by means of a convention between the Apostolic Chair and His Imperial Majesty, been divided into fixed ecclesiastical dotations (*in stabiles et ecclesiasticas dotationes*), be expended for the performance of divine service, for ecclesiastical buildings, seminaries, and for everything connected with the Church. In order to supply any deficiency His Majesty will, as he has hitherto done, generously give his assistance—nay, if the time allow it, he will even give greater assistance. The revenues of the educational fund will be expended exclusively for Catholic institutions and according to the pious will of the founders.

“ XXXII. The revenue of the vacant livings will, in as far as has hitherto been customary, go to the religious fund, and His Majesty, of his own free will, gives to the same the income of the vacant bishoprics and secular abbeys in Hungary and the countries formerly belonging to Hungary, of which His Majesty's illustrious ancestors had been in undisturbed possession for many centuries (*per longam sæculorum seriem*). In those parts of the empire, where there is no religious fund, a mixed commission will be appointed for each See, which will manage the estates of the diocese and all the livings while vacant. The Holy Father and His Majesty will agree about this matter.

“ XXXIII. During the recent changes the tithes were abolished by civil laws in many parts of the Austrian territory, and, as it is impossible, respect being had to the peculiar circumstances, to raise them again throughout the whole of the empire, His Holiness, at the request of His Majesty, and in consideration of public peace, which is of the highest importance for religion, permits and determines without prejudice to the rights of the Church, to receive tithes where they still exist; that, instead of tithes in other places, and as an indemnification for the same, the Imperial Government shall assign revenues of real property or Government stock, to all and every person who has a right to demand tithes. At the same time, His Majesty declares that these revenues shall be held on a good title (as if acquired by purchase for a valuable consideration (*titulo oneroso*); and shall be received by the same right and title upon which the tithes were held.”

The remaining clauses provide for the faithful execution of the Concordat.

“XXXIV. Everything else relative to ecclesiastical persons and affairs which is not mentioned in these articles will be arranged and managed according to the doctrines of the Church and the discipline approved by the Holy See.

“XXXV. All the laws, ordinances, and arrangements which have hitherto been in force in Austria and in the separate provinces, and which are in opposition to this solemn convention, are abrogated, and this convention shall henceforth in all the Austrian provinces have the authority of a law of the land. Both parties therefore do, for themselves and their successors, promise faithfully to observe all and everything which is herein agreed to. Should at any future time a difficulty arise, His Holiness and His Imperial Majesty shall enter into friendly communication, in order to remove the same.

“XXXVI. The exchange of the ratifications of this convention shall take place within two months from the date of these articles, and, if possible, sooner.

“In testimony of which we, the abovementioned Plenipotentiaries, have unto this convention set our hand and seal.

“Done at Vienna, on the 18th day of August, in the year of Our Lord, 1855.

“MICH. CARD. VIALE PRELA.

“JOS. OTHM. VON RAUSCHER.

Archbishop of Vienna.”

After reading the text of this treaty, we must be allowed to congratulate the venerable prelates, to whom the task of negotiating it was committed, upon the prudence with which they have steered clear of the difficulties of their undertaking. Those principles of ecclesiastical law and of spiritual right, which the Church cannot alter or renounce, are maintained; whilst every concession which the crown, or the exigencies of the national feeling, could claim, has been made. The young Emperor has not pleaded the vain excuse offered by the Emperor Nicholas, that he could not change the state laws; and has nobly avowed that a religious prince must defend the liberties of the Church. And whilst his own subjects will bless his name, the other children of the Church, spread over every part of the globe, will pray that years of happiness may be added to the life of the emperor, whose filial piety will prolong the years of the saintly Pontiff, by taking away from his paternal heart one of the deepest of the many sorrows which, since his accession to the Chair of Peter, he has so patiently and so meekly borne.

ART. VII.—1. *Traité de la Prédication, à l'usage des Séminaires*. Par un ancien Supérieur de Séminaire. (M. Hamou) Troisième édition 8vo. Paris, Leclercq et Cie. 1854.

2. *Précis de Rhétorique Sacrée à l'usage des Séminaires*. Par J. B. Van Hemel, Chanoine Honoraire d'Amiens, et de Malines, Vicaire Général de son Eminence le Cardinal Sterckx, Archevêque de Malines. 8vo Bruxelles, C. J. Fonteyn, 1855.

A PASSAGE in the preface to one of those works, in which the author, among other reasons for writing, asserts that he could find no manual of sacred eloquence for theological seminaries, may at first sight appear somewhat extravagant to a person having even an ordinary knowledge of ecclesiastical literature. For not only in the French language—so rich in all that the priest requires for the discharge of his duty—but in several others, there are treatises on sacred eloquence, some of them of very ancient date, composed by persons in every way qualified by their genius, their piety, their high station, and by what certainly is not the least recommendation, the eminent success with which they illustrated in their own sermons their rhetorical precepts. There are treatises on the subject by bishops, by founders of religious orders, and by popes. And why should it be otherwise? If the Spirit of truth raises up, as occasion requires, the great lights in Scriptural or theological knowledge, and in the laws and the history of the Church, why not expect that from time to time—and especially in days of crisis—some voice of authority should inflame the zeal and direct the energies of the clergy in that great function by which truth originally acquired and still preserves its empire among men? Accordingly, from St. Augustine to St. Liguori, many saints and doctors have written in some form or other, instructions on preaching. The principles expounded by the former at great length, in his 4th book, “*De Doctrinâ Christianâ*,” were promulgated by Pope Gregory the Great—“*De Curâ Pastoralis*,” the manual of the clergy during many subsequent centuries. In the revival of the twelfth century, the Dominicans and Franciscans received, from their founders or first generals, treatises or special admonitions on the same subject, and the sermon.

began to assume that form which it generally retains to the present day. In like manner, when the rebellion of Luther and Calvin involved the Church in the greatest of her combats, and called for all the energy and lights of her pastors, there appeared St. Charles Borromeo, St. Francis Borgia, St. Francis of Sales, Louis of Granada, and several others, who reformed the pulpit, and ushered in that great period when sacred eloquence rose to the very highest rank in the national literature of Italy and France, and became, what it still remains, the standard of the oratorical capabilities of their refined languages. Many other distinguished and pious authors might be mentioned who have written on sacred eloquence alone, or given it a considerable space in their treatises. But it must be now sufficiently clear that, if no manual or classbook of eloquence fit for a theological seminary could be found before the publication of those volumes, it was not that there were not at all times books, from which the clergy could learn one of their most important duties, but that a new method of teaching it had been lately introduced. A special course of lectures on sacred eloquence has been made part of college studies; and a treatise was wanting which, so far as the nature of the subject allowed, should be on the model of the manuals of theology and philosophy. It was to supply this want that M. Hamon, one of the most distinguished Sulpicians, published his "*Treatise on Preaching*."

The first edition of his work was published in 1846. Before that time, many, and before his third edition, nearly all the French bishops had established a special course of lectures on sacred eloquence for their theological seminaries. There is every reason to believe, that the change has been a great improvement. By facilitating and perfecting the ministry of preaching, it has been a powerful agent in the religious renovation of France. For that reason alone it should command our most attentive consideration, even though it suggested no reformation in our own colleges—a point, on which it does not become us as reviewers to offer any opinion. Our object is to give a plain and brief account of these two works; to compare the methods adopted in them; and, as a preliminary, to examine whether and how far they can be regarded as a departure from, and improvement on the old system of instruction in sacred eloquence.

Recurring, then, to the first complete treatise on sacred rhetoric published in the Church, we find there the great

principles, which, varying in their application and development, according to the various circumstances of the times, must ever remain substantially the same, the only true principles for the priest in announcing the Word of God. In that treatise, to teach how an ecclesiastic can acquire eloquence, St. Augustine presses into the service of the Church the most useful maxims of Cicero's best rhetorical works—modifying and developing, illustrating and restricting them according to the themes and the audience of the Christian orator. First he insists on the cultivation of genuine rhetoric. Is that art to be abandoned to the enemies of truth? Shall they insinuate themselves into the good graces of an audience by an artful introduction, and state falsehoods so briefly, so clearly, so like the truth, that they are admitted as such; and wield their arguments so dexterously that an answer seems impossible; and have completely at their command the hopes and the fears, the loves and the hate of their audience; while the minister of Christ can neither announce clearly the facts or the truths of the Gospel, nor exhibit them in appropriate or becoming ornament, nor attempt to speak from the heart “wiser than all the schools” without chilling, perhaps extinguishing every spark of feeling in those whom they address? No, he says; of the value, of the necessity of this art, there could be no doubt: the sole question was, how was it to be acquired?

For men advanced in years the rules of rhetoric, as taught in his time, were not, he believed, an advisable study. They were numerous, complicated, and full of technicalities, and, according to “the princes of Roman oratory,” could never be learned with advantage except in youth. Even for young ecclesiastical students, a course of school rhetoric was not, in all cases, paramount. It should sometimes give way to more urgent and important duties, especially as its place could be supplied by a plan of self-instruction, which he then goes on to explain. Constant and diligent study of the sacred Scriptures, and of approved ecclesiastical authors, accompanied by practice in writing, in *dictating*, and in speaking, were, he believed, an easier and more certain path to genuine sacred eloquence than any system of rhetorical precepts. A man of sensibility and intellect soon warmed into eloquence under the influence of eloquence heard or read. A man of inferior capacity could at most acquire, and with difficulty, an imperfect

knowledge of the speculative rhetorical precepts ; *his* best chance, too, was imitation—his best study the model ; the rules living and speaking in eloquent men. But not knowing the terminology and precepts of elementary rhetoric, how can we discover, or appreciate, or copy the perfections of our models ? The unlettered townsman, he replies, corrects the language of the learned rustic : the boy brought up from infancy in good society, speaks his mother tongue with purity, though he never saw a grammar, and detects the blunders of men profoundly versed in grammatical rules, but not favoured as he was in early life ; so they who have the tones of eloquence constantly in their ears, who live, so to speak, in communion with its great oracles, acquire, by the insensible influence of this intercourse, without speculative rules, the grade of perfection within the reach of their oratorical aptitudes. Eloquent men flourished before the rhetoric treatise was known : their example became its rules ; their practice its precedents—the imitation of them is the easiest, the best compendium of eloquence. He had known many who became eloquent without a knowledge of rhetoric ; he had not known one who became so without hearing or reading eloquent men.

By these observations, which must ever be first principles in every course of rhetorical studies, St. Augustine may appear so far to depreciate class rhetoric, as in fact to dispense with it altogether. But, remember that he speaks of the rhetoric of his age, with its formidable array of figures, the mere names of which frighten modern impatience ; and that in this very treatise, intended for those who were not to read rhetoric, he descends to critical elegancies on sentence-making and on style, in which few professors now-a-days would venture to examine their best drilled pupils. Meeting the difficulty which was often proposed, and which in his youth he had himself felt, namely, that the Sacred Scriptures were not eloquent, he undertakes to show that even as literary compositions, large portions of the Old and of the New Testament were models of true eloquence. This disquisition should convince the most supercilious pagan philosopher, that it was not the great Christian bishop and doctor only that speaks, but an adept in all the science of the Roman schools. Gliding into his subject then with the admonition that the Scripture was not the preacher's model in all things, for instance, in its obscurity, he proceeds to develope his in-

structions and lays down in detail ; first, the rules for the chief perfection of all eloquence, perspicuity : how it was to be attained in words and arrangement, and when propriety and elegance of diction were to be sacrificed for it without scruple. On this subject his dicta have become the maxims of all subsequent writers,* and are familiar to students who never attended a special course of ecclesiastical rhetoric. On this point, so far as mere instruction is concerned, he concludes, “ He alone is a good instructor who teaches truth, and teaches it so that he is understood.”

But plain food, he continues, is not enough : most men require or relish condiments ; the earnest and the studious, and they who seek truth for her own sake are content, if they find her though dressed in rags, in language uncouth, unnecessarily vulgar, or difficult. They, however, are the minority. In the Church, as well as in the forum or the senate, Cicero’s maxim is true ; eloquence is a three edged sword : the orator’s wreath has a triple leaf, “ the eloquent man must speak so as to teach, to delight and to persuade.” Starting from this assertion, he discusses how far and by what means the preacher must please his audience ; what ornament is compatible with the simplicity of the gospel ; what blemishes are unbecoming its majesty ; and how ornament can be made subservient to instruction and to persuasion. Then since it may happen that one is “ often instructed and pleased, and yet not practically persuaded ;” that “ truth demonstrated in graceful and becoming language,” does not command assent,” he prescribes the means for softening this obduracy, or rousing this indifference, or propelling this sluggishness, summing up with an application of Cicero’s words familiar to our schools, “ oportet igitur eloquentem ecclesiasticum quando suadet aliquid quod agendum est, non solum docere ut instruat, et delectare ut teneat, verum etiam flectere ut vincat.”

So far the substance of the first sixteen chapters, that is, about half the treatise. The remainder we must

* “ Qui ergo docet, vitabit omnia verba quæ non docent.” “ Quid enim prodest clavis aurea si aperire quod volumus non potest ; aut quid obest lignea si hoc potest, quando nihil querimus nisi patere quod clausum est.” “ Negligit verba cultiora, neque curat quid bene sonat, sed quid bene indicet atque intimet quod ostendere intendit.” “ Tamen sic detrahit ornatum ut sordes non contrahat.”

touch briefly. It rather illustrates by examples and exhibits in a new form, what has been already said, than proposes new matter. As in the forum then, there were three classes of cases, private money matters or civil affairs; great cases of life and death, or of public interest; and the intermediate class; so it was a maxim that the pleader should adapt his language to these three classes. In religion, it is true, no such distinction was known; there, everything was great: the widow's mite could stir the deepest springs of Christian oratory; still the principle was good: the preacher should fix his object steadily before him, and choose his language and his style accordingly.* He should know the plain and unpretending instruction; the more animated yet measured strains of commendation or censure; and the grand and stirring appeal to the heart.† The same truth, he adds, may require these three different manners according to the object of the speaker.‡ He then proceeds to illustrate them most lucidly by examples from the Old and New Testament and from some approved ecclesiastical authors, especially St. Cyprian and St. Ambrose. He shews how these styles should often be blended in the same discourse for variety or relief: and how it must not be supposed that each of the great ends of oratory excludes the other two. On the contrary, though one or two of them may in some circumstances be out of place, they are never so potent as in combination. For who is more efficiently instructed than he who is at the same time pleased and affected? When is feeling deeper and more unfailing than when it springs from pleasing instruction? What pleasure more genuine than the sympathetic throb of the heart, and the glow of

* “Et tamen quum doctor iste debeat rerum esse dictor magnarum, non semper eas debet granditer dicere.”

† “Is igitur erit eloquens, qui ut doceat, poterit parva submisce, ut delectet modica temperate, et ut flectat magna granditer dicere.”

‡ “Quid enim Deo ipso majus est? numquid ideo non *discitur*? numquid hic ornamenta et non documenta quærentur?—Porro quum *laudatur* Deus, quanta facies pulchræ et splendidiæ dictionis oboritur ei qui potest, quantum potest laudare.—At si non colatur, ut ab hoc malo avertantur homines, debet utique *granditer* dici.”

the intellect under the spell of true eloquence? This last is the regular, or, as it is popularly called, the set sermon, in which all the appliances of rhetoric are supposed to be combined for the three great ends of eloquence.

To attain proficiency in this art is the privilege of few; how many, he says, can at best deliver what they borrow? but in some respects, genius and dulness, the choicest erudition and the scantest competence are here on equal footing. Both hold the same divine commission; both can acquire those virtues which give weight to their words, which make the lowly style, sublime,* and the least adorned, persuasive; both can prepare themselves, as they are bound to do, according to their means; but the result is with God. Who knows what is best to be said?† or the best form in which it ought to be put? who but the Spirit of God alone that breathes as He wills—that hearkens to the prayer and guides the choice of humble earnestness and gathers in the elect by its ministry, while genius and learning are haranguing in vain—merely beating the air?

This is a brief summary of the chief principles developed in a few logical and eloquent pages by St. Augustine. They are the practical views of perhaps the greatest intellect that ever enlightened the Church, propounded at a time when the cross had long since emerged from the catacombs; when, in his own words, it glittered on the brow of the Cæsars; when Roman civilization, though in its setting, was still splendid; and Roman philosophy, more peevish perhaps as its end approached, sneered at the vulgarity of the Scriptures, or vented its hatred of the truth, in affected concern for the alleged rudeness of its preachers. The plan to prepare the ecclesiastic for those times was this: he should, if possible, read the course of rhetoric in his youth; he should devote himself to the perusal of the Scriptures and of approved ecclesiastical writers; study them by the few principles given above; compose or transcribe, and have some exercise in speak-

* “Non solum submisso et temperate, verum etiam granditer dicit, quia non contemptibiliter vivit;” “habet autem ut obedienter audiatur quantacunque granditate dictionis majus pondus vita dicentis.”

† Quis novit quid ad præsens tempus vel nobis dicere, vel per nos expediat audiri, nisi qui corda omnium videt?

ing; enforce his precepts by his example; prepare diligently according to his means; and pray to Heaven to direct and bless his instructions, "*hoc se posse pietate magis orationum, quam oratorum facultate non dubitet, ut orando pro se, ac pro illis quos est adlocuturus sit orator, antequam dictor.*"

It is not without diffidence that we venture to give this very imperfect sketch of the teaching of St. Augustine on sacred eloquence. But besides the advantage of keeping in view the opinions of one of the greatest doctors of the Church, it will save time in the analysis of a large portion of M. Hamon's work, which merely develops those principles. It appears to us, moreover, to have been manifestly the general plan adopted in ecclesiastical education, in which the rhetoric course almost invariably taught by ecclesiastics never lost its place in the trivium, even in the least fortunate ages; and in which, until within about the last twenty years there was not what could be called a special class or course of studies on sacred eloquence, though there certainly was at all times, in greater or less perfection, some mode of acquiring sacred eloquence like that recommended by St. Augustine. Thus, of the six theological seminaries in Belgium, mentioned in the appendix to the Maynooth Commission, three have no professor of sacred eloquence, nor does the name appear in the programme of studies for any class high or low. Does any Catholic imagine that there is no instruction, no exercise in preaching in those colleges? That the student's attention is never directed to the canon of the Council of Trent, which obliges the pastor to feed his flock with the words of salvation? No doubt it will be found that in these and in every seminary worthy of the name, the students generally attain or approach nevertheless the standard fixed by St. Augustine; that is, they who have a competent knowledge of their other ecclesiastical duties, know in general the objects and different kinds of sacred eloquence and the means to acquire it; and they are moreover obliged, as a college duty, to some exercise in preaching. We have had some experience in Irish seminaries at least; and we always found this to be the case. In Maynooth, for instance, there was formerly an exercise in sacred eloquence attached to the Scripture class. Afterwards, even when there was no instruction on the subject except from the professors of Rhetoric and of English in the Junior

College, and from the criticisms of the students themselves and of the presiding authorities, at the sermons delivered by the senior divines every Sunday; there was certainly among the students an amount of information, which would enable them to answer, if not with all the precision of the trained critic or philosopher, at least with the working knowledge required for ordinary use, nearly all the practical questions on sacred eloquence in general, contained in St. Augustine's manual, especially those on a regular sermon. They were taught to reverence the Scriptures as the fount of sacred eloquence; and St. Paul, whether preaching before the philosophers of Athens, or confounding the dissentient Jews, or, like a father, instructing, reproving, exhorting the faithful, as the great model of the Christian preacher. The first time we had the honour of entering the Scripture class, fresh from the September retreat which had been conducted with no ordinary eloquence by an Irish prelate, we remember very distinctly that the example of this prelate, his great knowledge and felicitous application of the sacred Scriptures, were among the chief motives urged by the professor to stimulate our zeal for the study. No, the models of eloquence proposed to us were not the great lawyers, nor the great statesmen, nor the great popular leaders, except so far as they illustrated the general principles and taught the language of eloquence;* the models were either the plain solid instructions in the sermons and other spiritual works of St. Liguori; or (we are sorry we cannot say the Fathers commonly, whose works are not easily procured) those illustrious orators of the seventeenth century, who in a great measure owe their enduring fame to the fact that their best plans and noblest conceptions, and most vivid imagery are confessedly borrowed from the Fathers. Ravignan may truly proclaim that as yet Bourdaloue is the prince of preachers; and Bourdaloue and his great contemporaries, sovereigns like him in modern literature, whom neither the jealousy of heresy, nor the

* En tercer lugar se ha de recoger abundancia de terminos: la qual de ningun modo podrá alguno adquirir perfectamente, sino *con la mucha leccion* de los libros que estan escritos (los mas bien escritos) en la lengua nacional, de que usamos en los sermones."—Louis of Granada, Rhet. Eccles. Lib. vi. c. xii. § 1.

rivalry of nations, nor the indifference or hate of deists and philosophers can dethrone ; these were the men whose works were the most coveted literary prize and the ordinary companions of the young priest leaving college.

Now comes the question, was not this system sufficient ? What is to be the improvement ? or what is it in the present state of the world, that calls for any improvement ? M. V. Hemel states truly, that within the last twenty years, a new system has been introduced into the greater number of theological seminaries : that, besides the ordinary course of rhetoric, a special course of lectures on sacred eloquence, has been generally established. Now we are no advocates for the unrestricted application of the argument that, because a custom obtains in France, or Belgium, or Germany, therefore it ought to be introduced at home ; for we believe that France, and even Belgium might learn something from Ireland, as they did of old. So far, too, as our personal knowledge goes, the standard of sacred eloquence is not falling ; on the contrary, the proportion of priests who could deliver a becoming and effective instruction, is every day increasing ; still, when a Church like France, the favored mother of sacred eloquence, with abundance of first-rate rhetorical treatises, and sermons, and courses of sermons, for every class and for every occasion, which should make even the indolent and the dull, imbibe the spirit of eloquence ; when such a church thinks it advisable to change her system ; the system under which she reared, not only her great ones of the seventeenth century, but a succession of sacred orators, all but of the first order down to the present day ; the change seems to demand the serious consideration of all who are in any way responsible for the improvement of ecclesiastical studies. No wonder that extraordinary care should be given to preaching in the Church of France. By what other means could she hold her ground against the array of false science, of jealous legislation, and of that dangerous thing, the little learning, the agent in every village of a hostile university ? By what other means could she repair the havoc of the last century, or hope to act on the unbelieving multitude in her towns, or nerve the young against the very special dangers that awaited them ? As every possible mode of attack had been tried against the truth, every legitimate mode of defence was brought to oppose them ; the rules of sacred eloquence were studied more

in detail, that the preacher might more surely discover and develop his own particular talent, and more skilfully oppose himself to the everchanging forms of a false philosophy, not confined to books, but rapidly spread among all ranks of people by licentious journalism. Hence, the martyred Affre, after his elevation to the see of Paris, in 1841, marshalling the arms of the church at the headquarters of revolution, in a very remarkable pastoral, which indeed might be called a treatise on ecclesiastical studies, assigned a very prominent place to sacred eloquence; sketched with a master hand its adaptation to the wants of the day; and recommended its models, the yet unrivalled models of the reign of Louis XIV.; those great lights on whom the young French priest is taught to look as his guides to true glory, unbewildered by the gloom or the glare of false philosophy or of false eloquence; the men who raised the character of their country with their own; the fathers, not of French eloquence merely, but it may be said of the French language itself. This course of sacred eloquence, however, sketched by Mons. Affre, was for the Sorbonne, not for the seminaries; and as carried out since, it differs entirely from that of M. Hamon's to which, for the present, we intend to confine our attention.

Before we proceed it may be useful to warn some readers that, though M. Hamon writes a new course of lectures, he makes no profession of having discovered new principles; he merely illustrates and develops the old, and considers them separately, and applies them in greater detail. There is no royal road to eloquence; no chance of discovering new springs of pathos; new laws of lights and shades in the realms of imagery, to refresh or adorn, or shorten the old, well-beaten paths of exposition or argument. His object was to produce a treatise which should contain all the true principles by which young ecclesiastics could learn to preach, both with the spirit of the Gospel, and with pure literary taste. It should lay down the rules for all the different kinds of preaching from the panegyric or funeral oration, or episcopal pastoral, to the simple admonition, or announcement of a festival, or of a fast, or the elementary catechetical lesson. Its style should neither be "drily plain," uninviting to the general reader, nor yet the blooming, portly, oratorical lecture, in which the principles would not stand out in sufficient distinctness to be easily seen by the ordinary student, preparing for the

searching interrogatories of a professor, who was to conduct his class as nearly as the difference of subjects allowed, like a class of theology or philosophy. It was to be a treatise which the student could easily understand and retain, and with which he could, if necessary, easily refresh his memory on the mission. And here it may not be unnecessary to state, that, though M. Hamon discusses very minutely the different kinds of sermons, he never becomes unintelligible to the ordinary reader; never encumbering his instructions with these rhetorical technicalities, which it has been truly said, but too frequently, only “teach the workman how to name his tools.”

The treatise is divided into two parts; the first on preaching in general, and the rules applicable to all sorts of religious instruction; the second on the different kinds of sermons, and the special rules applicable to each.

The two first chapters introduce the subject with an appropriate description of the dignity of the preacher's mission, grounded on the sublimity of his themes; the all important interests involved, both as regards the preacher himself, and his audience, the Church and society at large, time and eternity; next the obligation of preaching; who are bound, how is it fulfilled, what are the lawful causes of exemption?

After these preliminaries, Chapter III. marks out in general the subjects or matter of sermons,—what is, and what is not to be preached; among the former the fundamental truths of religion; the four last things; the prominent facts in the history of religion; other articles of faith, and dogma generally; the commandments of God and of the Church, and the rules generally of Christian conduct; among the latter, novelties; subtle school questions; difficult objections known to none of those whom you are addressing.

The fourth chapter describes at considerable length, the manner, style, general qualities of sermons; how the preacher can discover his own capabilities: adapt himself to the intelligence, taste, feelings of his audience; attain all those objects already sketched from St. Augustine, whose principles are here fully developed in the following summary.

“Des qualités de la prédication. Art. 1. It ought to be suited to the preacher. Art. 2. It should be suited to the audience. § 1.

Suited to their understandings. 1° Fault of the preacher who does not make himself understood. 2° How to make oneself understood. Choice of the subject and of the manner of treating it. Plan of the discourse. Great perspicuity necessary. Rules for attaining it, as regards diction in general : construction and phraseology, and general sequence of the discourse. Rules to be observed before and after composition. § 2. Sermons should be suited to the spiritual wants of the audience. 1° This rule essential. 2° How to comply with it. You must know your audience : have in view the wants of the different classes of your hearers : apply yourself to the ruling passions, the principal abuses of the parish. Rules to be observed in denouncing disorders, and in depicting vices. Personalities to be avoided. § 3. Preaching should be adapted to the temper, dispositions, etc. of the audience. The necessity of such precautions. How to use them. What is becoming in certain circumstances of time, place, etc. Oratorical precautions. Rules to be observed in them. Art. 3. Preaching must be instructive. §. Instruction necessary both as regards eloquence and faith : §. 3, how to instruct, to state the Christian doctrine : to prove and to refute. Art. 4. Preaching ought to *please*. Three meanings of that word, 1, to please necessary in the two first ; 2, as to the last, no one should attempt to please by wit or affected elegance ; 3, nor by *Romanticism*. 4° You should please by true and solid eloquence. Objections against these assertions refuted. §. 2. How to please—by your own morals : by the matter of your sermons : by your manner. Rules for words—for the construction of phrases : for elocution : for style : for the point of view in which you are to place the subject. Art. 5. Preaching ought to affect : what is meant by affecting or moving the feelings : this quality essential in preaching. §. 2. How it is to be done. 1° Conditions required for exciting the emotions by preaching. Prayer and good example. Knowledge of the temper of your audience. The orator himself should feel. Sensibility necessary for a good preacher : vivid expression of the emotion felt,—by the aid of imagination, of the principles of rhetoric, of good taste. 2° How to direct those pathetic appeals. Six rules on that subject. Some observations on the three last articles. Art. 6. Sermons must have unity. §. 1. Unity indispensable, 1° its definition, 2° its necessity proved. §. 2. Means for preserving unity in a discourse. Unity of design, or end. Unity of means or plan. Formal division sometimes necessary, sometimes not. Rules for the division. Rules for a plan without a division. The plan once formed, all the thoughts in the sermon must suit it ; how to arrange them, and to connect them by transitions.”

- The object in transcribing these contents of the fourth chapter is, that those who take an interest in the matter, may form an opinion on this course of lectures ; and we believe that those headings will be more suggestive than

any analysis however elaborate. The fifth chapter devotes seven distinct sections to the qualifications of the preacher: his legitimate mission; the purity of his intention, and the means to acquire it; his edifying life, and practical inferences therefrom; his zeal; his spirit of prayer; his talent for the pulpit; its characteristics, and necessity of cultivating it; his learning; secular learning; sacred learning, knowledge and application of Sacred Scripture, of the holy fathers, of ecclesiastical history, of theology, and of spiritual writers; finally, ideal of the perfect preacher realized in St. Paul.

The second part of the first book discusses some very important questions regarding the preparation, proximate and remote, necessary for the preacher. What course of reading should he adopt? how is he to turn it to account, by a diary or common-place book? what subjects, and what manner or style is he to select for preparatory exercises in composition? then, when he is about to exercise his ministry, must he write his sermons? must he deliver them word for word, as they are in his manuscript? or is it enough to write out all the matter, and in the order in which it is to be delivered, but without the intention of binding himself to the precise words? is a rough sketch of the principal heads sufficient? or may one ascend the pulpit after some short meditation? what of those who preach the sermons of others, and of the precautions advisable in that case? How to write the sermon; what are the practical directions, for choosing, and meditating, and developing, and composing, and revising, and committing it? Next follows a very useful chapter on delivery, to which Demosthenes assigned the first part in eloquence, and which Louis of Granada makes second only to the grace of the Holy Ghost.*

In this first book there is not much that could not be very well taught, at least in a general way, to a philosophy or rhetoric class of junior students in an ecclesiastical college. A great part of it ought to be so taught, and cannot be learned too soon; especially the general direc-

* En segundo lugar, despues de la gracia del Espíritu sancto, á quien damos la primacía entra la habilidad de pronunciar, la qual es increibible quán grande imperio tenga en el decir. Lib. vi. c. xii. no. 3.

tions on the objects, and aids of eloquence, and the hints on remote preparation for the pulpit, though no single section in the book could be effectively taught with all the author's developments, except (by a revision at least,) to students more advanced in their ecclesiastical studies. The second book is less general in its precepts, and more exclusively applicable to pulpit eloquence. It is on the different kinds of religious instruction, and the special directions for each. It is divided into two parts, the first on the different subjects of sermons, the second on the different forms in which those subjects are proposed.

The subjects of sermons are classed under eight heads.

1. The dogmatic exposition of Christian truths, with the view chiefly of confirming faith; the statement of the same truths as incentives to good conduct; practical rules for such sermons, particularly on God, and on His attributes, on salvation, on death, on judgment, on heaven and hell.

2. Next follow sermons on the mysteries of our Lord, and of the Blessed Virgin; how they are to be treated, and best made known to the faithful, with directions on the proper plans for such subjects.

3. In moral discourses, how the virtues and vices are to be described, and the means and the motives proposed for avoiding one and embracing the other; with practical directions for the division of these indispensable instructions.

4. On the sacraments; manner of teaching them, their dignity, necessity; and the dispositions, obligations, and ceremonies accompanying.

5. Directions for sermons on prayer in general, and for several particular forms of prayer.

6, 7, 8. Panegyrics of the saints; sermons at the reception or profession of Religious; and funeral orations.

The second part of the second book, on the different forms of sermons, commences with the rules for a regular sermon; that is, one consisting of an exordium, proposition, division, proof, peroration, according to the principles of rhetoric, as illustrated particularly in the great Lenten or Advent sermons of Massillon or Bourdaloue. It next proceeds to the rules for a course of sermons, for instance, on the creed, on the commandments, on the sacraments, on the history of religion,—a mode of preaching which has been found to develop the energies of the preacher, and to secure the greater attention and interest of the

audience. Then follows the homily, that is, a running commentary on a gospel, or epistle, with appropriate moral reflections; next, the prone, holding a middle place between it and the regular sermon: unlike the homily, it is confined to one subject; unlike the regular sermon, it is not under the rigid rules of rhetorical plan; but rather in an easy, artless, but becoming style, converses with the audience as the father with his children. Finally, we have directions on public advices, or admonitions, for particular occasions; on these conferences, in which another ecclesiastic proposes to the preacher, some question or difficulties; on religious addresses; on public reading of religious books; and on sermons for missions and retreats. These nine different forms of preaching are followed by one to which the author allows more space than to all put together. It is developed with the most elaborate care, and is of itself a monument of the extraordinary exertions of the French clergy to save the young generation from the contagion of irreligious influences, by a course of catechetical instructions suited to their years, from infancy to manhood. Seven modes of teaching catechism are described, with ample developments and minute details, on the place, the time, the method, the rewards, the punishments, everything, in a word, found by experience most useful in the performance of this arduous duty.

We can scarcely hope for the preceding detail, what our author does for his book, that it will not be distasteful to the general reader. May we venture, nevertheless, to hope, that to all acquainted with, and interested in ecclesiastical studies, it explains fully enough the course of sacred eloquence now established in most of the theological seminaries in France. This is our object. For it has been asked, what is a course of *sacred* eloquence? how does it differ from rhetoric on the one side, and theology on the other? or from both combined? or from the sermons of the students in every well governed seminary? These questions, it is hoped, are answered by the contents of this book. By them, moreover, we can perhaps judge whether such a course ought to be generally established. That many of the clergy speedily acquire by practice and by private reading, all the useful information in this treatise, we are not inclined to question.—But is it desirable for all? do all acquire it in its full development? or when acquired, retain it as tenaciously, or use it as readily, as

knowledge learned in youth by college training, under a professor, both from the class treatise, and from different sorts of sermons, composed and delivered by the pupils themselves?—By diminishing the difficulty, would not this course increase the number of sermons, and enable the young priest to ascend the pulpit with as much humble confidence as he enters the confessional? Are there in Ireland leisure and opportunities abundant to complete on the mission an education in sacred eloquence? Should it be said, on the contrary, that Ireland is very unlike France, that faith lives amongst us; that there is little necessity of sounding the dispositions, or of carefully gauging the degrees of hostility or indifference to the faith in our chapels;* that the old instruction in sacred eloquence, which was good enough for France before Voltaire and the revolution, is good enough for us? Certainly there is a very great difference between Ireland and large portions of France; and under a clergy as effective as the present, Ireland will never have either her Voltaire, or Voltaire's revolution. Yet, it must be said manifestly, there has been a great advance within the last twenty years in the education of the Irish Catholics generally; language, if not learning, has improved even in secluded rural districts; and in the large towns, or wherever bad books circulate extensively, the arms to which the French priest is now trained, would not perhaps be altogether unnecessary. It might be most useful, in a word, for the young priest to have the collected experience of a country like France, that has been tried so severely, and has combated so gloriously. If Ireland has kept the faith firmly, she should neglect no means of keeping it for ever.

Having now given a general view of M. Hamon's book, we cannot proceed to M. Van Hemel, without noticing what appears to us a serious defect, not in the work itself, but in the place which it is to hold in the college course. As we collect from the preface, it is intended exclusively for theological students. Except the ordinary rhetoric course, conducted, it is true, by ecclesiastics, and

* "Aujourd'hui l'action du Prêtre rencontre dans plusieurs une masse de préjugés, de prétentions, de doute et d'indifférence, accumulés par les long efforts de l'irreligion dans le temps qui nous ont précédés."—Lettre Pastorale de Mons. Affre, 1841.

receiving from them an ecclesiastical tendency, there is no special instruction on sacred eloquence, or any branch of it, until the student commences his theology. If this be so, is it the best? In a new scheme of oratorical studies for clerics, are Demosthenes and Cicero, Aristotle and Quintilian, to reign sole models and arbiters of eloquence, during the most susceptible period of the student's life? Wisely the general practice of seminaries has retained these great masters of the "speech divine;" but would it not be well to give them colleagues; to illustrate their principles in another sphere; to show the young student that Mount Sion and St. Peter's give wider range and nobler flights than the forum or the acropolis; and that to acquire the "grave yet brilliant style of oratory,"* recommended by His Holiness Pope Pius IX., he has competent masters and models in the Church? Something of this kind, would seem desirable, the mode and particulars to be determined by circumstances. It is a remarkable part in the plan of M. Van Hemel's instructions, of which we are now to give a brief notice.

M. Van Hemel has had charge, during the last thirty-two years, of this branch of instruction in the seminary of Mechlin. Last summer he published his treatise. It would have appeared, he tells us, long before, had it not been for a controversy of some standing, viz. whether a course of sacred eloquence, for the philosophers was sufficient, or whether it should be continued for the divines. This controversy, His Eminence, the Cardinal Archbishop of Mechlin decided by the statutes of his seminary. There are now two classes; the matter being apportioned to each according to its standing and acquirements. During the two years of philosophy, there is an elementary course of sacred eloquence, which includes the theory of the art, the general principles of eloquence applied to preaching, some exercises on recitation and delivery, and a few original sacred compositions. This course occupies two lectures per week, an hour each; there being during the first two

* "Ministri recte tractantes verbum veritatis, et non seipsos sed Christum crucifixum prædicantes sanctissimæ nostræ religionis dogmata et præcepta, juxta Catholicæ Ecclesiæ et Patrum doctrinam gravi et splendido orationis genere clare aperteque annuntient."—Eucyc. SS. P. Pii IX. Nov. 9, 1846.

months of each year, a preliminary revision of the same treatise of rhetoric, which the students had read before they commenced philosophy.

“To prevent this preliminary exercise from becoming too abstract or uninteresting, I always accompany it with an explanation of one of the most remarkable and *most regular* productions of the French pulpit. I point out the exemplification of all the precepts that we have been revising, and I descend to even the minutest details of æsthetics. I even refresh their memories in the rules of grammar as well as of rhetoric, with all the patient accuracy of a professor explaining to his pupils an oratorical *chef-d'œuvre* of Demosthenes or of Cicero.”—Introduction, p. 9.

An admirable programme, if the students know French, as well as they generally, indeed, always know Latin or Greek, before they are introduced to Cicero or Demosthenes. If the first difficulties of the French language are surmounted, and the pupil is prepared in some way to appreciate the beauties of a foreign style and expression, there could be no better system of elementary instruction in sacred eloquence, wherever French is learned, than a few sermons of Bourdaloue or Massillon studied on the plan of M. Van Hemel. But if the sublimity and grace of their oratory are shackled with all the points of elementary grammar, they can no more teach, we fear, the precepts, or infuse the spirit of eloquence, than the great traveller could stretch his limbs when he first awoke in Lilliput.

The remainder of the two philosophy years is so employed by M. Van Hemel that his whole work is studied. It consists of three parts, the two first being in general matter and order the same as M. Hamon's; the third is a history of sacred eloquence, including a dissertation on the eloquence of the scriptures. We should have stated that during the first year, he also gives private instruction on delivery during recreation time, three hours a week, to batches of his pupils, ten or twelve at a time. This completes the first course of sacred eloquence taught to the philosophers.

The second course for the divines consists “of the practical part, and all that regards immediate preparation for preaching; the composition of whole sermons: the application or more developed exposition of the precepts of eloquence; and the theory and practice of catechetical in-

struction both of children and of adults." Thus the seminary of Mechlin keeps up a course of instruction on preaching from the time the boy leaves the rhetoric form until the priest receives his mission.

It is a delicate thing to offer an opinion on the studies of a college with which one is not intimately acquainted. This system at Mechlin appears complete; still would it not admit of improvement? The whole work is intended, it seems, (p. 9) for the philosophy students; now, does it not appear extremely doubtful whether such a treatise could be best learned by them? In substance it is the same as M. Hamon's, but rather more developed and comprehensive. Look over the summary of M. Hamon's given above. Granted that there is nothing in the first part of it too advanced for the diligence of the young philosopher, can he profit much by the second, which descends to theological details of which he is supposed not to know much more than the catechism; on which certainly he has received no professional instruction? We should prefer a system in which, at least, the second and third parts of M. Van Hemel's treatise are reserved for theological students; being convinced that, if a few questions which they had already heard discussed in the searching style of Catholic school divinity, were afterwards proposed in a popular discourse by the most accomplished among themselves, far greater benefit would be conferred on the whole class, and a more clear and certain mode of dispensing their acquisitions, and of combining knowledge and eloquence, would be opened, than by almost any amount of rhetorical instruction given to the philosophy students.

Our two authors, like all their predecessors on the same subject, admit that here precept avails little without practice. M. Hamon recommends and enforces five sorts of exercise: the delivery of portions of sacred eloquence selected from the great orators; discourses, or parts of discourses, composed by the students themselves during their vacation or other leisure hours: a discourse on some historical subject in the Scriptures or the Lives of the Saints, proposed only the evening before; catechetical instruction according to the practical method of Devie, bishop of Belley; or, in fine, the announcing of festivals, or the giving of admonitions—the former from the Ritual of the diocese, the latter from the *Méthode de Besançon*.

One practice is omitted, or at least has escaped our no-

tice in reading these works—the delivery of sermons by *all* the students more as a religious than as a class exercise. Where this custom prevails, the sermon is preached, on Sunday, before some hundred students, many of them not the preacher's classfellows, in the prayer-hall, from the pulpit, in presence of superiors who are known to regard it, not as a literary recreation, but rather as a function which may sometimes decide their opinion on the preacher's fitness for the ecclesiastical state: there may be some abuses, but none so great as not to leave this custom, all due deduction being made, still far the best that could be established as the *common* collegiate exercise. In a large community it carries out, in a great measure, for all the students the object of that statute of the Seminario Pio, which provides, that "some theological students, qualified for the duty, shall explain the holy Gospels at Mass, from the pulpit on Sundays." We never knew a respectable student, preaching in the circumstances above described, who was not anxious to exert all his powers, nor any student who was not afraid not to acquit himself decently. Whatever system might, therefore, be adopted for philosophers or for theologians, or for both, the public Sunday sermons, preached by all the senior theologians, are undoubtedly the most suitable and the most useful conclusion of the common collegiate education in sacred eloquence.

Reviewing then the French and the Belgian plans, it would seem to us that the principle of the latter, sanctioned by the Cardinal Archbishop of Mechlin—namely, the division of the course of sacred eloquence into two parts—is in the main desirable. But we doubt whether M. Van Hemel does not expect too much from students in philosophy; or at least whether what he expects from them could not be more speedily and more efficiently learned in a more advanced period of their course. Nothing can be farther from our minds than to find fault with the practical course of either M. Hamon or Van Hemel. On the contrary, we are convinced that each is best suited to the college in which it is established. If we have questioned them at all, it is rather in the abstract, or with reference to their introduction into other colleges.

Let us suppose, then (had we the management of concerns so important), a class instructed in the ordinary course of classics, especially in the orators and in the rhetorical works, whether of Cicero, of Quintilian, or of Aris-

... moreover, in their own language ; familiar with the best models ; practiced in some degree in the art of composition ; with such a knowledge of English literature as pious young ecclesiastics may and should have ; and above all well impressed with this idea, that the composition of a good sermon should be in the end, for all, the principal ; for the great majority, almost the sole practical object of their English education ; if a class so instructed had, moreover, an elementary knowledge of French, we should deem it a serious omission not to use the oratorical treasures of that language as a means of promoting sacred eloquence. For, suppose that in the commencement of the college year, you place in the hands of the philosophers one of the great sermons of Massillon, the preacher of the heart, whose conferences they had perhaps heard with enraptured awe, during their inaugural retreat : suppose that they study this sermon on M. Van Hemel's plan ; the professor taking care to illustrate as they go along with it all the rules of a regular discourse—as taught, for instance, by St. Liguori ; if, moreover, they are warned that, after they have finished the sermon, and while engaged in some other part of the French course, they should be all summoned on short notice to write before the professor, an abstract of the same sermon, or a part of it, and that these compositions would be publicly read, criticised, and corrected in the lecture hall : if the same course were adopted with a sermon of Bourdaloue, the preacher of the intellect, in the commencement of the second half-yearly session, (exercises in written translations of the best passages having been, it is supposed, a fixed duty, the whole year) ; would not such a plan be a most useful element of clerical education in French literature, in general literary taste, and especially in sacred eloquence ? Would it not fix for ever in their young minds, not the abstract precept, but the example better than all precept ? It would not expect so much from the philosophers as M. Van Hemel ; it would make them learn only one kind of sacred discourse, but that the very highest—the set sermon—from models of universally acknowledged superiority.*

* Due grandi nazioni stanno disputandosi questa corona : la Francia e l'Italia—Bossuet il predicator dell'immaginazione ; Bourdaloue, il predicator della ragione ; Massillon, il predicator del cuore :

Persons, we know, object—"Are the preachers of Louis le Grand proper models for the instructors of the poorest people in the world?" Why then, we ask, retain Cicero or Demosthenes in the clerical schools? Why not poke out some second or third rate orators to teach the Latin and Greek languages, and the style suited for popular instructors? or is it pretended that Massillon and Bourdaloue are not as perspicuous, as adapted to the capacity of the ignorant as other great orators? The more familiar a person becomes with them, the more this objection disappears. They preached, it is true, to the court of Louis XIV.; but they are no exceptions to the rule, "that sublimity always is simple"—for, with the exception of Bourdaloue's divisions, and occasionally his reasonings, we doubt if there be in all their sermons, either statement, or illustration, or argument that does not or could not, with a slight change, produce all its effect on the humblest poor of Christ. Besides, is too sublime a style of preaching, or too refined a language, the danger to be most apprehended in a poor country? Does it not, on the contrary, often require, in sermons to the poor, constant care to comply with the admonition of St. Augustine, on the decorous simplicity of the preacher's style, "*Sic detrahit ornatum, ut sordes non*

ecco un triumvirato pari a cui ultro non ha nè la greca, nè la romana eloquenza—Ed ecco pure i tre grandi modelli per la cui meditazione si eleva, e s'ingrandisce la giovine mente dell'oratore."—Lezione, 22. Part. Sec. In Italy "Molti si posero nella gloriosa via—ma, un solo (degneri) ne trionfo valorosamente."—Lez. 23, *ibid.* Audizio—Lezioni di Sacra Eloquenza.

"Pero la verdadera gloria de la eloquencia sagrada se debe enteramente á los oradores Franceses." "Solo los Franceses tomaron el justo tono, en que debia hacerse oír la oratoria sacrada."

"Pero dexando aparte la eloquencia sagrada de los Alemanes y de los Ingleses, mas ascetica, por decirlo asi, y catequistica, que parenetica y oratoria—dexaremos en quieta possession del principado oratorio, á los predicadores Franceses, y daremos una ojeada a algunos italianos—que pueden con algun titulo entrar en cotejo con los Franceses."—Andres, *Historia de toda la Eloquencia*, cap. vii. Madrid, 1789. His parallel between the sermons of the Fathers and those of the great French preachers (*ibid.*) brings out the reasons why some of the latter (Bossuet not included) are preferred in France as models for young writers, chiefly for their regularity.

contrahat?" and if the standard be not high in early youth it can with difficulty be sustained in later life. The Pope, certainly, apprehended no danger to popular instruction from the study of the highest models of sacred eloquence by the young, when he lately ordered "young ecclesiastics to acquire genuine elegance and eloquence of writing and speaking from the most learned works of the holy Fathers, and from the most distinguished pagan authors."* The study, both of these pagan authors and of the selections from the Fathers, is combined at Mechlin with the study of the great modern French preachers. Why may they not be combined elsewhere? Should a person persist that it would only introduce a French fashion, and a style and manner suited only for France: the answer is, with an eminent bishop of Barcelona, that French fashion happens, in this instance at all events, to be the unchanging fashion of nature.† The best possible course of sacred eloquence for the philosophers we believe, then, is the study of the great masters of the French pulpit; as auxiliaries where the Fathers are studied, and as admirable substitutes where they are not. But little or no benefit, we are sure, ever can be expected from a course of sacred eloquence in the French or in any other language where the difficulties of the language itself have not been previously surmounted.

With regard to the second course of sacred eloquence for theologians, those who have seen it in operation, must, for the present, be our chief guides. Never having had

* *Adolescentes clerici, humanioribus litteris, severioribusque disciplinis, potissimum sacris, ab omni prorsus cujuscumque erroris periculo alienis, ita diligenter imbuantur, ut germanam dicendi, scribendique elegantiam, eloquentiam tum ex sapientissimis sanctorum Patrum operibus, tum ex clarissimis ethnicis scriptoribus ab omni labe purgatis addiscere valeant.*—*Encyc. SS. P. Pii IX., Mar. 21, 1853.*

† *Asi no tengo reparo de aconsejaros, amados Hermanos mios, que despues de haber estudiado esta Rhetorica, leais algunos sermones de los mas célebres Predicadores Italianos y Franceses, no para copiarlos, sino para observar en illos bien practicadas las reglas que aprendisteis.* Joseph Clement, Preface to his Edition of Louis of Granada's *Rhet. Sacr.* p. 111. The great French preachers ordinarily devoted two months to the composition of each of their grand sermons. *Ibid*, p. 5.

the benefit of such a course, we cannot speak from experience, but must content ourselves with imagining under what system we wish we had been instructed. Give us then a large class as a stimulus to exertion and to emotion, but not so large that every one cannot have opportunities of trying his strength in the presence of all his competitors. Suppose it the ordinary class in a large college numbering sixty or eighty. Our equipment, we suppose, is a fair knowledge of the general principles sketched above from St. Augustine; a more methodical and practical knowledge of the same principles as exemplified in the great sermons which we read in our philosophy year; some practice in English composition; and an ardent desire to become effective preachers, to wield with dexterity every weapon in the armoury of the word against every enemy of catholic truth and virtue. We should have precept, and example, and exercise. But as it would not be desirable, even were it possible to exercise all, in all sorts of preaching, the order of M. Hamon's treatise must be reversed for our accommodation. We would begin at the end. We should be taught first all the forms of sermons with their special rules from the great sermon to the catechism (which we can very well learn though only in the vestibule of theology) and if we were under a professor who had previously known our skill in composition and speaking, he would be able to assign to each of us, if not without mistake, at least with some discrimination, that form of sermon which suited our capacity; three or four at least of the questions discussed in our theology in the commencement of the year being always included in the programme of subjects, and generally allotted to the most promising students. We should, moreover, deliver the whole or part of these discourses in the lecture hall in presence of the class and professor, to whom we had previously submitted them, and receive their advice and award on our performances. By these means, all of us hear so many specimens of the different forms of sermon, that with ordinary attention, they are for life fixed in our memory. The lectures not occupied in the delivery of these discourses, should be devoted to the methodical study of some manual approved for the purpose, like those which we are noticing, if not the same; a certain portion being marked out for each lecture, in which the student is to be interrogated as in theology or philosophy. We should

also wish to see the rules of sacred eloquence illustrated by the writings of the Fathers according to the plan sketched for the course of sacred eloquence in the Sorbonne.* To stimulate our ardour and appeal to our

* Après avoir exposé les règles de l'éloquencē sacrée, le professeur de ce cours fera parler les Pères les plus eloquens, leurs heureux ou foibles imitateurs. Ne perdant jamais de vue le but pratique de son cours, il ne se bornera pas à citer leurs chefs d'œuvres, il fera remarquer avec plus de soin encore leur parole simple, leur style abondant en images, en similitudes, en traits, et en expressions empruntées à la Bible. S'il fait admirer les discours prononcés dans des circonstances extraordinaires, qui ont favorisé les mouvemens de la plus haute éloquence, il n'aura garde d'oublier le ton habituel de leurs homélies, de leurs instructions, quand ils s'adressoient à des artisans ou à des laboureurs."—Lettre Past. de Mons. (Affre) sur les études Ecclesiastiques. Paris 1841. We abstain from any suggestion on the introduction of the Fathers into the classical course, as we have no experience in the matter. The Mechlin plan is thus described by M. Van-Hemel, "Nous voulons de plus que dans les classes inférieures, on n'explique simultanément avec Cornélius, César, Cicéron, &c., que les Pères les plus élégants, les plus corrects, et les plus faciles. Sulpice Sévère et Lactance auront donc d'abord la préférence, Viendront ensuite Minutius Félix, Vincent de Lérins, saint Jerome et saint Ambroise ; saint Hilaire de Poitiers, saint Léon, et S. Bernard se réserveront pour la seconde et la rhétorique ; S. Cyprien, S. Augustin, et Tertullien, s'expliqueront plus convenablement en philosophie et en théologie. Il en est de même des Pères grecs, on commencera par S. Jean Chrysostôme et l'on procédera successivement à l'explication de S. Grégoire de Nazianze, de S. Basile, de S. Grégoire de Nysse. Il est entendu que Xenophon, Demosthène etc. auront leur place voulu dans ce plan d'études."—P. 603. To the objection that the works of the Fathers could not be had he replies "Non ; certes, il ne faut pas beaucoup de livres ni beaucoup de temps non plus, pour exécuter les plans que nous proposons. Nous mettons même en fait que avec les quatre ouvrages publiés en Belgique depuis une vingtaine d'années on a tout ce qu'il faut pour s'initier pleinement à tous les secrets de la littérature sacrée, et pour puiser avec abondance aux inépuisables trésors des œuvres oratoires des Pères. Ces quatre ouvrages sont, viz. Flores a Patribus et Scriptoribus Ecclesiæ latinæ selecti ad usum juventutis humaniorum literarum studiosæ, Mechliniæ, 1 vol. Delectus opusculorum ex Patribus ad usum scholarum philosophiæ et theologiæ. Mechliniæ, 1 vol. Opuscula selecta Sanctorum Patrum. Gandæ, 10 vol. Bibliotheca ascetica, curâ et studio

prudence, we should have the usual number of examinations (in writing) and the same collegiate honours as for other classes. Such is the rough draft of our scheme, to be developed, corrected, improved by the most enlightened guide of theory, experience. In a college, where the rule obliged all the senior theologians to preach as a religious exercise, and where the junior students would have the benefit of the course already described, this second course need not occupy much time, nor interfere seriously with theological or other studies. Twenty or thirty lectures altogether, one a week, suppose during a college year, would exhaust M. Hamon's treatise. But if it were determined to continue, on M. Van Hemel's plan, some instruction on sacred eloquence all through the college course, we would restore the patristic homily to its proper place, the Scripture chair; and select from the exercises recommended by M. Hamon, some flowery episode for the ecclesiastical history class, provided that competent judges on the matter, experienced, learned professors, approved the union. More masters than one would be in this as in other branches of education, a great acquisition.

What fruits then might be expected from this system? In our candid opinion if the fruits were to be extraordinary the Church would have long since enforced this second course of eloquence in theological seminaries. We expect no wonders. We do not believe in the discovery now, in the nineteenth century, of any new or great principle in a sacred function, coeval with the Church, so general and so practical as preaching. But certainly whatever benefits (and they are not few) the new system has produced in France, Belgium, and other countries, it would produce in Ireland. The Irish clergy are harder worked. Once on the mission they have less leisure, less opportunities to enlarge their acquirements. A college training would be relatively a greater benefit to them; and who that knows them doubts how they would use it? Their oratorical power never has been questioned even by their enemies; its untrained energy may have been open to ridicule, but seldom to contempt. Common as the national emblem, it springs

L. B. Malou Episcopi Brugensis, Lovanii. *Novemdecim Bibliothecarum illius opuscula facile voluminibus quinque compinguntur.*

up even where least expected. We are not speaking now of that clerical eloquence which, on the same themes, could often claim kindred with the eloquence of Burke, Sheridan, Grattan, Plunket, Canning, Curran, Sheil, that is of nearly all who have won the highest wreath of eloquence in a land where eloquence wins the richest prizes of ambition ; an eloquence from which Montalembert, and through him the continent, caught some of his wisest inspirations ; whose clearest and boldest notes, even in times of despondency and danger during the last forty years, nerved the tones of O'Connell, demanding the liberties of the Church, and denouncing that ignominious ecclesiastical code lately abolished in Austria ; an eloquence which must have awakened by its success Catholic nations to the importance of cultivating it, and of establishing those new collegiate courses of sacred rhetoric which now send back to Ireland the echo of her own artless but powerful strains. No, we are considering the eloquence of the Christian pastor to his flock, on their Christian duties ; and we affirm that there is at present, (and that there will be, so long as the warm heart is the best spring of all great thought,) as much genuine eloquence in the humble chapels in Ireland as, in the same number, in any part of the Church. What we hope from this new course of eloquence would be to develope this great power ; to establish by degrees a school of sacred eloquence which should rival in brilliancy the Italian, in perspicuity and pathos the French, and in popular argument far surpass the English. The foundations of such a school would be laid, we believe, by the plan we have sketched. Then from our first entrance into college, the thought would be kept steadily before us, that eloquence was to be a chief means of utilizing all our studies ; and exercise and instruction on the subject would accompany us from our college catechism on to canon law ; through rhetoric, and English and French, and church history, and theology, and Scripture ; should we receive at an early period some instruction like M. Hamon's on remote preparation for the pulpit ; how to discover our own talent ; how to select our line ; how to make and to use a "*receuil* ;" to nurse with reflection the thoughts born from present studies "warm with life ;" —those inspirations that rise when most unsought, and which alone have the freshness of originality. Even under such a system we could not expect but that some would neglect these, like

many more opportunities; and that others, after some impulsive efforts, would leave their "*receuil*" a blank: but many on whose beardless cheeks a superjuvenile strain of muscle hardly compresses the smile, when asked how they would apply some rule to a sermon in that distant future when they may be parish priests, would then certainly devote themselves at once and vigorously to a study which would accompany them through their whole course; to punish their indolence by its undiminished difficulty; and to reward their industry by college honour, increased facility, and ever accumulating wealth of materials. They would be convinced when they reviewed their juvenile efforts, that nothing but labour, constant labour,* could enable them to avoid the "*insipiens eloquentia*," denounced by St. Augustine, and inspire them, by combining fervour, pure taste and knowledge, to make Irish eloquence as distinguished in the annals of the Church as it is in the annals of the empire. "*Tantum lucere vanum, tantum ardere parum; lucere et ardere perfectum.*"—S. Bernard.†

* *Caput autem est, quod ut verè dicam minimè facimus (est enim magni laboris quem plerique fugimus) quam plurimum scribere. Cic. de Orat. l. 32.*

† We repeat that in discussing the Mechlin plan we did not presume to question its perfect adaptation to the institution in which it is established. It has been warmly approved by the Cardinal Archbishop of Mechlin. "*Ce Précis de Rhétorique sacrée à l'usage des séminaires, rédigé avec soin et après une longue expérience de l'enseignement, par Monsieur J. B. VAN HEMEL, notre Vicaire-Général, est depuis longtemps classique dans notre Petit Séminaire qu'il a dirigé avec le plus grand succès pendant vingt ans. Ce livre renferme en abrégé et d'une manière méthodique les préceptes que les saints Pères, ainsi que saint Charles Borromée, saint François de Sales et saint Alphonse de Liguori ont donnés pour bien annoncer la parole de Dieu. C'est pourquoi Nous permettons volontiers que cet excellent traité soit publié; et Nous recommandons à tous les prédicateurs et surtout à ceux qui sont chargés d'expliquer le catechisme, de se bien pénétrer des sages règles qui y sont tracées. Nous ne douterons point que, s'ils suivent les bonnes méthodes qui y sont indiquées, ils n'obtiennent les plus heureux résultats.*

"*Donné à Malines, le 30 Mai 1855.*

"ENGELBERT,
"Card. Arch. de Malines."

ART. VIII.—1. *The Obstacles which have retarded Moral and Political Progress.* A Lecture by the RIGHT. HON. LORD JOHN RUSSELL, M. P. London; Nisbet and Co.

2. *On the Nature of an Inaugural Discourse. An Introductory Lecture addressed to the St. James's Young Men's Society.* By HIS EMINENCE, CARDINAL WISEMAN. London: Richardson and Son.

OUR readers are doubtless aware of the extent to which some of the best interests of mankind have of late years been promoted by the delivery of lectures by several of the ablest men of the age, to numerous audiences, on questions of great importance, and in a form calculated to convey information to every variety of enquirer. This method of instruction has numerous advantages,—and among its not least important are the opportunities which they afford of taking up and refuting, with as little delay as possible, erroneous and injurious statements, which if unanswered and unrefuted might create lasting impressions, by reason of the weight of the authority by which they may have been enunciated. Such a necessity has recently been occasioned by the lecture which is placed at the head of this article, in which Lord John Russell has done his best (as our readers will perceive) to fortify and support the attack which he some years since commenced upon our Holy Religion and Institutions. It will be seen that by the lecture of the Cardinal Archbishop, which is mentioned secondly, His Eminence has come (as usual) to the rescue; and has done most excellent service, in bringing into full view and exposing those portions of the address of Lord John Russell, wherein his Lordship has most signally failed in doing justice to the Catholic Religion. We have been so fortunate as to obtain an early copy of the lecture of Cardinal Wiseman, and we think we cannot better serve our holy cause than by giving to it as speedy and as extensive a circulation as our means will command. The lecture was delivered at the opening of a series of lectures to be addressed to the young men of “The St. James’s Society;” of which His Eminence was kind enough to take upon himself the inaugural address; and the following is the commencement of his discourse:—

“One of the most difficult tasks that can be imposed on a speaker, is that of making an inaugural address. He is supposed to be raised on an eminence, and to have mapped out the whole course of the lectures about to be delivered; to be possessed of their subjects and understand their connection; and more or less to have in view distinctly before him, the object or end to which they are to be directed. His discourse has to be a preface to all that shall be afterwards said. If this course of lectures had to be upon some united subject, were I aware that you were going to have five or ten discourses upon one particular branch of science, or literature, or art, their principles would be well understood; and it would be easy to anticipate what must be addressed to you, and in laying out before you from the commencement the whole plan that was to be followed, and preparing your minds for the particular influences which were intended to be exercised.

“But I just observed that an inaugural address should be like a preface, and those who have had any experience in book making are aware that a preface is the last thing which is written; that the author has composed his work and prepared it for the press, and has even put it into the hands of his printer, and sheet after sheet is rolling out from the steam press before he has quite decided what his preface shall be; and it is only perhaps on reading his own work over again, that ideas are suggested from it that he thinks it right to communicate to his readers before they enter into the body of his work. And then he gives them such premonitory principles as will enable them to judge more favourably of what he is about to put before them, and assist them in following the train of his thoughts. And so perhaps he apologises for the defects, and prepares them for the excellencies of the work which had been written before the preface was composed.

“Now, I unfortunately am not in a position to do this. When I look over the syllabus of the lectures about to be delivered, which was only put into my hands a few days ago, it is impossible for me to say how I can predispose you, further than by fully guaranteeing the character of their authors, and the principles which are to be inculcated here. With these exceptions, I have no means of preparing you for what you will hear, further than by saying that I am sure you will be instructed and interested.

“Again, the preliminary discourse may be somewhat likened to the prologue of a drama, which passes through several acts, and the beginning of which consequently is often obscure, so that at first the hearers or readers are in the dark, wondering, what will be the issue? what is the character of each actor? and for a short time there is an amount of perplexity in arriving at a sufficient knowledge of these matters to be able to take an interest in a complicated plot. And, hence, some character connected in some way, perhaps, with the action of the piece, comes forward, and endeavours to prepare the minds of the hearers as to what

is the subject, and moral of the piece. The ancients did this in a more simple style, and one which shows how much they valued this sort of preliminary information. For example, in one of the plays of Plautus, the person who speaks the prologue, tells you who he is, and what are those around him:—‘My name is Mercury, this city is Thebes, this house is inhabited by Amphitryo, married to Alcmena, the daughter of Electra.’ Thus you are put in possession of a great deal of very simple but useful information. Sometimes it was more explicit; for example, ‘There was a certain old merchant in Syracuse, who had two sons, twins, so like one another, that their mother could not distinguish one from the other. This is what I heard lately related by one who knew them in their boyhood, I having never seen them myself, so do not fancy that...Now, one of the twins who lives in Syracuse, is come with his servant, to Epidamnus, to see if he can find his twin brother. This city is Epidamnus so long as this piece is acted; when another has to be performed it will become another city.’ Such is the style in which, in the old times, a dramatic performance was introduced. The whole plot was anticipated, and brought naively before the hearers, so that they knew beforehand what sort of entertainment they were going to have.

“Or if we choose to employ another similitudo, and one which perhaps shows my task to be more difficult, we may say that an introductory discourse bears the same proportion to the series that will follow it, as an overture or symphony may, to a long, protracted, and varied composition of a high standard, such as an oratorio. I remember once being present at a very interesting musical entertainment, given as usual abroad, by the students of an institution in Rome; when a friend of mine, who had a better idea of the principle than of the nature of an overture, while the musicians were stringing up their instruments, and producing fearful dissonances, listened attentively for some time, and then turning to his neighbour, who was near me, observed—‘I cannot say that I admire that overture very much.’ The answer was, ‘Why, they are only tuning their instruments.’ To which he replied, ‘Perhaps so, but one can judge from that what it will be.’ But seriously, if we hear an overture commence with martial strains and the majestic movements of a march, and with an outburst of trumpets, kettle drums, and such instruments as accompany the action of an army, we know that we are going to listen to strains of warlike, and heroic, music. Whereas, if there is at the commencement, the waving of more graceful movements, and softer airs, we at once expect something more romantic or tender. But generally some of the principal airs of the piece will come like faint sketches in the varied harmonies, floating echoes strangely anticipating future distinctness of expression. The forms of melodies pass in shadows before us, like the kings in Macbeth, to start later into realities, that seize the soul which they have first

haunted. Germs graceful and concentrated, which will afterwards expand into florid completeness, breathing an air of full-blown harmonies are there, but just beginning to grow. Or the more precious gems of song are there set in golden frames, or they are like delicate textures which nature has wrought, and then at once embalmed in transparent amber. In this way it is that the preliminaries of a great musical composition come before us. But, here again, as the prologue could not have been written except by one who has already read through, and is well acquainted with every portion of the plot, so cannot a symphony be prepared except by a master mind, already retaining within itself, sounding in the ears, and swelling in the soul, all the beautiful conceptions that are to be afterwards developed, and the varieties of exquisite harmonies which are to carry along the audience for hours in ecstasies of pleasure and delight. I pretend not to the skill and power so to interest you, or to be in possession of the means strictly to make this address an inaugural one, so as to make you more prepared, and better disposed, than you are at present to receive instruction, and enjoyment, of a virtuous and improving character, from all that you will hear in this place.

“I undertook to speak of the nature of an inaugural discourse, and all that I have said goes to one point at least, that mine must be a total failure, looking at the subject on its positive side. I must therefore content myself with a negative view, and see whether it will be in my power to inform you what an inaugural discourse ought not to be.

“Even this branch of the subject, which will occupy us the rest of the evening, requires its own short preface, or preliminary discourse. I shall therefore begin by saying, that an address of this character should not be such, as in any way to mislead the judgment, or misdirect the feelings, and that it should address itself to the intellect and the heart, in such a way as to improve both, rather than to impair or injure them.”

The distinguished Lecturer then proceeds to develop the particular subject of his discourse, and to draw attention to the special position of his audience; “young men” anxious to receive important instruction on important subjects.

“There are, I believe, but two Young Men’s Societies in this metropolis. The other is more extensive, counting more illustrious names than yours; one which meets in a place neither genial nor congenial, except when its heavy atmosphere is brightened by the genius of Handel or Mozart. If you look over the list of those who are to address it, or who compose it, it will be easy to judge that the spirit which guides them and that the principles which they profess, are

not only very different from those which we shall seek to inculcate here, but are in direct antagonism to them. I will not even tell you to look over the list of lectures that have been delivered there, or are about to be delivered, in order to satisfy yourselves on this point. I will only tell you just to note the words in which this society had the presumption the other day to address a Catholic Sovereign, the guest of our gracious Queen; and then you will easily perceive that its greatest glory consists in destroying all that we here are most sedulously engaged in building up. This society has had lately delivered to it, an inaugural address, as you are now listening to one. It came from the lips of one who occupies a high social position, who has held the most distinguished office which a subject can hold under the Crown; one who has appeared as a gifted author and as a great orator upon many occasions. Such an one when first appearing on an occasion like this, in such a field, must have been considered as greatly strengthening the hands of those of whom he constituted himself the colaborator; and as greatly intensifying the feelings of those whom he addressed; and such an appearance was undoubtedly a great honour and distinction for them. He has also been on every occasion, the professed champion of civil and religious liberty; although it has been his misfortune to have been the only individual in the United Kingdom, who has ever introduced a penal enactment against any class of Christians.

“Now, many of you will probably have heard the title of this discourse, and most interesting it is, on “The Obstacles which have retarded Moral and Political Progress;” a title at once most captivating. And you may most naturally be desirous of gaining from one who is a master in political science, the information on such a subject which you naturally would expect from him. You probably have heard something of the outline of that discourse. The object of it was to inculcate to those young men who had been known for years to belong to the ultra-anti-catholic party, who were known to have nourished, and to be constantly stimulated to, the strongest antipathies to Catholics, that nothing can be more opposed to moral and political progress than religious hatred, than persecution, than bitter controversy. Now, what more tempting than to read such principles inculcated by one so well able to give them their full force? But instead of encouraging you to seek in that quarter for information on such a subject as this, it becomes my duty, being placed here in so very similar and parallel a position, to warn you against it; and to tell you, seek not there that which will either guide your judgment aright, or direct your feelings kindly. I consider that discourse as well adapted for most painfully illustrating the negative of my subject; for showing you what an inaugural discourse ought not to be; that is, it should not be such as to mislead the intelligence of youth. Bright-eyed and open-fronted candour should be the queenly form which the

guidance of such a man should take, when walking before an army of confiding youths on the path of knowledge on the way to wisdom and virtue. The concealment of one half of the facts on a great historical question, the reticence of what would counterbalance and completely neutralize the other half, is in itself an intellectual misguidance, a manuduction to error. It is my duty, therefore, to caution you against being so misled.

It would appear that the noble Lord has fallen into various errors, which it is not material for us to notice, except for the purpose of remarking how frequently in matters connected with Catholics even the leading intellects of the age are found to be uninformed. His Lordship had strangely fallen into the old blunder about "the Jesuits'" Newton; and in correcting that error has made a mistake of three hundred years in attributing the institution of the "Minims" to St. Francis. After referring to these mistakes, the Cardinal proceeds with the main charge against his Lordship:

"Now the noble lecturer, intending to prove that persecution, or religious oppression formed one of the greatest obstacles to moral and political progress, names four instances by which he will prove or illustrate his theme. The first of these is the ancient persecutions of Christians by the heathen emperors; and we must all agree that nothing could be more atrocious or unjust than those great persecutions. Every one will agree with all that the noble lord said concerning the constancy and fortitude of the Apostles and martyrs in giving their lives for Him who had given His life first for them. But what is the conclusion to be drawn from this part of history? I will read that drawn in the lecture. 'I need not relate to you what fearful martyrdoms, what cruel massacres followed the adoption of this principle of persecution. Far from preserving public peace, the system of punishing Christians convulsed the empire, and was so far from being successful, that it finally terminated in the establishment of Christianity.' Then it follows from this that the establishment of Christianity was the result of an obstacle to moral and political progress. I of course agree that the persecution was atrocious, and that the Roman empire was convulsed by it; but when the noble lord tells us that the result of this persecution was the establishment of Christianity, and then brings persecution forward as an obstacle to moral progress, I must conclude that he thinks the converting of the heathen empire to Christianity was a going back in its morality and its policy. If the conclusion had been, that persecution fails in its objects, or leads to results contrary to those intended, the conclusion would have been just. But here


persecution, in doing so, laid the only solid foundation of moral and political progress. Judge too, if there can be a lower view put before young men of the oppression of the Christian religion, in its very infancy, than by treating it as a mere question of political wisdom. The place from which to look at these persecutions, is a far higher ground, which, I know not why, was here neglected. The noble lord refers to the Apostles, and says, they claimed a right to speak as God urged, in spite of punishment. He had just before elicited a laugh by a passage from Dr. Johnson's life, in which he said that 'those who were in power had a right to persecute, and those who were persecuted had a right to suffer.' On the first part of the proposition, there is nothing to be said; but the second part is consecrated by an authority too holy to be laughed at; that is, that where there is persecution it is a right, a noble right, it is a privilege, it is the highest dignity to be enabled to suffer, and to give our life, if possible, for the vindication of the truth. The whole system of Christianity is built on this foundation. On this groundwork, its divine Author so rested the evidences of His religion, that persecution was a necessity for its very stability. However we may detest the cruelty of the persecutor, we must bow down in admiration and awe at the wonderful providence of God, which made these persecutions as necessary for the triumph of His Church, as He made the envy of the pharisee and the sadducee, and the cruelty of the Roman soldier necessary, for His being exalted on the cross to save mankind. We look at the persecutions of the early Christians, not as mere political events, but we consider them as evidences of a mighty design, which rendered them absolutely necessary. Therefore, so far from quoting these persecutions in favour of the noble lord's proposition, we should say they tell against it; for they prove that Providence may permit persecution for the promotion, not the impeding, of the greatest possible moral and political good."

Lord John Russell produces and professes to deal with three other cases of persecution; and our readers will not be surprised to find that they are all cases of persecution of Protestants; but we think they could scarcely be prepared for the one-sided views of the noble supporter of religious liberty, which the Cardinal proceeds to develope and expose.

"All who heard that lecture would imagine, and go away with the idea, that he who spoke it knew of no other persecutions by which he could illustrate his theme, except those in which Catholics were the actors and Protestants the sufferers. Now, what I have said before comes in here; that to suppress one half of the facts, and to prevent those stated from being counter-

balanced by them, is to mislead. There is a note added in the published edition, in which it is said that the penal laws in this country and Ireland were a bad exception to the general rule, but there is not a word throughout the lecture as spoken, that would not impress upon all who heard it, that Catholics had been always systematic persecutors, and that there was on the other side nothing but patient suffering. Is this fair, is this right, is this the way to teach history to young men, and on a subject on which the mind may so easily go wrong, and in a place where all the bias would be so much upon the wrong side? I do not wish to go through a wearisome and painful task of recrimination. That is not my object; I wish merely to establish the balance of truth; supposing all to be true upon the one side; I wish merely to place a counterpoise upon the other, that we may put both out of our minds, and go straight forward without heeding them more.

“ There are three scenes of persecution brought before us by the noble lecturer. The first is the persecution of the Protestants in the Low Countries; the second, is the persecution in France about the same time; the third, is what are called the Dragonades in France under Louis XIV. These are the three great historical pictures, which he brings up to show you that persecution always retards moral and political progress. I admit that, at the periods referred to, there was a great deal of religious excitement which led those who were in power, whoever they were, and whatever was their religion, to use the temporal sword in vindication of what they considered spiritual truths; but is it fair to conceal what took place in this country? Is it possible to have been forgotten, that at the very time at which the alleged persecution of the Protestants in the Low Countries was carried on, there was a similar persecution in this country; that it was felony and death for a priest to put his foot in this island, that in the course of time there were some hundreds ignominiously, cruelly put to death, merely because they were Catholics; that there was constant forfeiture and deprivation of property; that a Catholic could not educate his child in his religion without incurring the penalty of death; that he could not go beyond a few miles from his house; that he could not come up to London on business without the license of five magistrates; that his house was often hemmed round with soldiers who ransacked every part? Dr. Lingard quotes authorities of the times describing what they felt and suffered. Sometimes swords and lances were thrust even into the beds to slay any priest or recusant that might be concealed there. Is it forgotten that this went on, not as did the persecutions selected in the Lecture, for a year or two, during a short time, that could more truly be called a time of civil war, than a mere religious persecution, but for nearly three hundred years in this country without abatement, till the Catholic religion was almost trodden out of the land? Or do you suppose the hearers were meant to be



led to believe, that in this England the sword never has been raised by the persecutor, that there never was an Act of Parliament against those who professed a different faith? Is that the way really to illustrate history, overlooking examples that do not lie abroad? Of what use is it to instruct young men that justice and clemency ought to be followed, merely, by telling them that in Canton, a city in which we have great influence, there have been since February 70,000 executions? What care the young men of Exeter Hall for that? No; teach history in your own country from its own annals. Point out the errors and faults, that you wish to be corrected and avoided, as they existed among those whose language was the same, whose habits and feelings were identical with our own, and whose history therefore is naturally the most instructive and the most interesting. This is surely the most profitable way to teach history; and if we must put one set of religious severities against another, we shall find enough that should teach noble lecturers to remember the ancient proverb, that 'those who live in glass houses should not throw stones.'

"This may appear to be merely retorting the charge. But surely the noble lord knew, that if the Catholics under the Duke of Alva put Protestants (often under arms) to death, even to the frightful extent of 100,000 persons, the Calvinists were not one whit more sparing. Feller says, that Vandermerk, a Protestant general of the Duke of Orange's, 'killed more Catholics in the year 1572 than the Duke of Alva did during his entire government.' And if this be a Catholic authority, I would refer you to the Protestant history of the Reformation in Holland by the Protestant minister De Brandt; or to the frightful accounts of the atrocities committed on the Catholics by the Calvinists, delivered by a Protestant historian Kerroux; atrocities so inhuman, or rather so 'infernal,' as Dr. Milner calls them, that I could not detail them to you."*

The Huguenots, of course, are a prominent illustration of the theories of Lord John Russell. For the real history of these transactions we need only refer our readers to the researches of Dr. Lingard; we cannot, however, refrain from quoting the evidence of Dr. Lardner on this subject:

"*'A conspiracy against royalty became the first act of Protestantism in France, and thus hundreds of loyal subjects and rational minds were alienated from it. The Court with some reason, henceforth declared against it an eternal war.'*"

* "Letters to a Prebendary," Let. iv. note.

All the atrocities alluded to by Lord John Russell are on the part of the Catholics ; but the Cardinal reasonably asks,

“ Would it not have been fair to say that they were at any rate, cruelties committed in war, when the blood was inflamed by similar acts upon the other side, and when the country was in that horrible state when murder begets murder, and family feuds are multiplied to the extermination of races, and one act of vengeance follows upon another, until we contemplate the state of a once-flourishing nation with horror? Why cite persecution of Protestants by Catholics as an obstacle to moral and political progress, where there is quite as much to be said upon the other side ?”

The eminent Lecturer then proceeds to cite from De Thou, (who is cited by Lord John,) no less than five passages containing instances of brutality exercised by the Protestants on the Catholics, but for which we must refer our readers to the lecture. The comment of his Eminence is as follows :

“ I should not have disinterred these acts of barbarity, exercised by Protestants on Catholics, if it were not necessary to answer what becomes, by being unmodified, a gross and grievous calumny. It is most painful to have a vast hall filled with cheers at the idea that Catholics have persecuted Protestants in France. Is it not fair that youth should hear but one side, and not learn that the same history which furnishes the authorities for the persecution on the one side, furnishes equal facts for the other? Well, against persecutions in the Low Countries, which lasted for a short time, I put the persecutions in England, which lasted for centuries ; and against the cruelties said to have been practised on the Huguenots, by Catholics in France, I put the cruelties exercised by the Huguenots on the Catholics, at the same time. I may remark, also, that if you will read the history of the period, you will find that the Crown of England, held then by a Queen of a very different character from the one who now fills the throne, through its Ministers, was in league by this very Huguenot party, to get them the throne of France, and that there was no stone left unturned, and every sort of assistance and support was given to that faction for that purpose. Do you think that if they had become the ruling and dominant party, Catholics would have had toleration? Judge from their acts of the most atrocious cruelty. You may safely conclude that if dominion had been added to their power, it would only have increased that intolerance and hatred, which certainly were the

dominant feelings of those who waged war against the Church and Crown of France.”

The fourth pleading of Lord John Russell relates to the Dragonades in France; which were probably occasioned as much by political as by religious animosity; and which (as the Cardinal well shows) find at least their parallel in the persecutions in Scotland, immortalized as they are by the pen of Sir Walter Scott. The Cardinal proceeds to point out numerous other omissions of Lord John Russell in making out “the balance of facts” which impartial history most clearly establishes.

“If any one brings forward to me the assassination of Coligny the leader of the Protestants, which casts infamy upon the memory of her who plotted it, I will quote the assassination of the Duke of Guise which took place a short time before, he being murdered as the head of the Catholic party. Jean Poltrot de Mercy, ‘had embraced the Protestant religion with great ardour. Irritated at the prosperity and successes of the Duke of Guise, he determined to kill him. This he often declared in the presence of his friends.’

“Having shot the duke, and being arrested, he charged Coligny, Theodore Beza, and others, with having instigated the murder.

“De Thou remarks, that Soubize, one of the Protestant leaders, had sent Poltrot to Coligny to hear the result of a great battle, about which there were conflicting reports, ‘and that the admiral did not send him back. What adds still more to the suspicion, and creates a belief that Poltrot had been sent expressly to assassinate the Duke of Guise is, that Coligny gave him money to buy a coureur. De Poltrot then went to the royal army, and committed the murder.’

“Throughout I only desire to put one accusation against another, and then both may be banished, if not from history, at least from instruction. I shall be told, perhaps, of St. Bartholomew’s, but if any one will read Dr. Lingard’s note on it, it will satisfy any sensible man, that there was nothing of a religious massacre in it; that it arose accidentally, because, Coligny not being dead, it was understood that the Huguenots were going to take arms, and begin on their part a universal massacre, and it was thought necessary in self-defence to be beforehand. He proves this from the official despatches of one who was on the spot, whose testimony has never been denied. Well, then, you who bring me this forward, have you never heard of Glencoe, of the Catholic inhabitants of a whole Scottish village being massacred with the approval of the king, and certainly of his ministers,—of William III., whose memory is so much blessed? It was one of the most cool and deliberate plots of destruction ever carried into effect. Mac Donnel, who had been

given a time, as all the disaffected had, to make his peace with government, was sent about from place to place, so that his oath of allegiance would not be accepted until the day of grace was passed,—then, for a whole week, the troops destined for this act of cruelty, were quartered among the inhabitants—lived with them as friends, and not one gave warning of the coming danger. And then, in the dead of the night, they set on them, closed in as they were in the valley, so that not one could escape, and they were massacred in cold blood. If you read some of the anecdotes of that fearful day, you will see whether we have need to be proud of what then occurred. ‘Where Glenlyon was quartered, the soldiers took other nine men, and did bind them hand and foot, killed them one by one with shot; and when Glenlyon inclined to save a young man of about twenty years of age, one Captain Drummond came and asked how he came to be saved, and shot him dead. And another young boy, of about thirteen years of age, ran to Glenlyon to be saved, he was likewise shot dead.’ One witness ‘did see Glenlyon’s landlord shot by his order,—and a young boy, of about twelve years, who endeavoured to save himself by taking hold of Glenlyon, offering to go anywhere with him if he would spare his life, and was shot dead by Captain Drummond’s order.’* There is nothing in St. Bartholomew more cold-blooded than this.”

The third and fourth volumes of Mr. Macaulay’s history have appeared at so recent a period as to preclude our entering in our present number upon the subject of the deplorable Anti-Catholic bias which pervades his very important and interesting narrative. We refer to it at present for the purpose only of directing attention to his minute and graphic account of the massacre of Glencoe, and of expressing our regret and surprise at his attempt at a personal vindication of King William. The “balance of account” proceeds to set off the revocation of the edict of Nantes against the awful atrocities in Acadia; the scene of Longfellow’s touching “Evangeline,” and for the full details of which our readers are referred to the pages of Protestant Lord Mahon. The matter of the “account” is summed up as follows:

“Now, young men of St. James’s Society, call upon your friends of Exeter Hall to strike a balance of facts,—ask them to put one item against the other; and I think that if we come to calculations, credit will not be upon their side. But tell them that if they will

* *Mis. Scott.* pp. 16, 18.

agree to cancel the account between us, once for all, we have had plenty of that ware from them, and want no more.

“ If I could flatter myself that there was sufficient of generosity in those who teach these young men, to accept a fair challenge of charity and peace, I would ask you to draw up an application or request, that it should be understood between the two Societies, that no allusion should be ever made to religious persecution on the one side or the other. And if you could obtain it to be made a rule of that society, then I would counsel you to make it a rule of this, that all subjects that can irritate the mind, or excite unkindly feelings towards any class of our fellow subjects, should be banished completely, and never allowed to be alluded to in either. If this were done, then I believe that there would be a much more real and solid ground for kindness, toleration, and charity, among the people of England, than we can hope for from literary institutions, or scientific lectures.”

The Cardinal closes this part of the subject with the following stinging conclusion upon the argument of the noble lecturer :—

“ Where is the logic of the lecture discussed? You would suppose that the argument would take this form. Here are cases of persecution, no matter by whom or on whom ; I will now show you that every one of these cases was followed by retrogression, by the loss of political importance and moral worth that followed it, and I will prove to you therefore, that religious persecution is an obstacle to moral and political progress. But there is not one word in the whole of the lecture to enable any one to draw this conclusion; and it appears as if its whole object was to make that subject, an excellent opportunity for drawing pictures of catholic persecutions, and then to leave it there. In fact, so far would such a consequence have been, that we may assert that if there was ever a time when political progress was greatest, in the history of the very kingdom represented as persecuting, it was at that very time or immediately after. For France never reached such a pitch of prosperity in political influence and external policy as under Louis XIV. ; it is the culminating point of French power. While the question to be discussed was whether persecution be one of the causes that retards progress, throughout the lecture there was no connection between the facts cited, and the conclusion to be drawn.”

Our distinguished lecturer proceeds to analyze the literature which Lord John had recommended, and to warn his auditors against the dangers of adopting his Lordship's advice :—

“You often find that the theme at such a meeting as this, is, ‘an evening with Shakspeare, an afternoon with Milton, a night with Burns.’ It is usual to take up a poet, some for whom the speaker has a particular affection, and to explain and develope his beauties. So is there in this lecture, a class of reading particularly recommended, but against which I think it my duty to warn you. There are two authors mentioned twice together, with particular praise, and then one of them is commended a third time alone. Locke and Milton are spoken of as good wise men, and they are also especially referred to, in connection with our subject. It is to this that I wish most particularly to draw your attention. ‘We have now,’ says the noble lord, ‘attained to that freedom of discussion, that religious liberty, which good men sighed for, which Milton eloquently demanded, and which Locke established by argument.’” Young men are therefore directed to the reading of these two great English authors, if they wish to know the principles of religious toleration, which was demanded by the one, and defended by the other. And it is fair to tell you what class of writings young men are directed to in Exeter Hall, in order to derive their principles of toleration.

“Locke has three letters on toleration, which occupy two hundred and sixty-six folio pages. The first letter contains his own principles, the other two are a tedious vindication of them against an anonymous assailant. In the first letter he lays down his principles, and he beautifully reasons upon the duty of the state to grant universal toleration, and argues that religion is a matter of the soul; that civil government has nothing to do but with the body; that it is folly to think of persuading men by violence; and that a religion against conscience is no religion at all. He reasons admirably; and then he comes at last to ask this question, as the second one of his treatise, ‘How far does the duty of toleration extend?’ Now you will see how wide and ample are his principles. ‘Public worship ought to be allowed to Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists, and Arminians, and Quakers.’ I pause here to observe, that at the time the noble lord said the penal laws were a bad exception to the general rule, that rule was persecution. At the time Locke wrote in 1691, these sects were all excluded from toleration, though Catholics continued to be the exception after all the others were released; but at that time they were all proscribed, and denied toleration without exception. Therefore the general rule was what the noble lord stated to be the exception. But this is not all, Locke goes on thus: ‘Nay, if we may openly speak the truth as becomes one man to another, neither Pagan, nor Mahometan, nor Jew, ought to be excluded from the civil

rights of the commonwealth because of his religion.' * Now after including Pagans, Mahometans and Jews, among those who have a claim to civil rights and religious toleration, you would suppose the foundation wide enough to include us. But no, after these liberal admissions, he proceeds to say that, there are two classes which must be excluded from all toleration, Atheists and Catholics. Atheists because they do not believe in God, and therefore no law will bind them; Catholics because they believe that faith is not to be kept with heretics, and that power is founded on grace ; (I pause to observe that so far from this being a catholic doctrine, it was the old heresy of Wycliffe and Huss,) and that the Pope can depose sovereigns. And therefore catholics are a body always watching to catch the government weak enough to take from the crown all its power. This is the first author to whom young men are to look as vindicating the true theory of toleration, that is, toleration to all but Catholics."

Milton next comes under the notice of His Eminence, and after a glowing eulogium upon the poet, which if space allowed we would delight our readers by inserting, he proceeds with the great poet's views on Toleration :—

"When he is recommended as a great writer upon this subject of toleration, we must look not to his vigour and eloquence, but to the truth of his principles ; and when young men are three times told to read Milton, and he is put with Shakspeare, as an author whom they are to read with their Bible, in their search after the true principles of liberty, it is well to test the value of this recommendation.

"We have a treatise of Milton's upon toleration ; and from the very title you may judge what we may expect in it. 'Of True Religion, Heresy, Schism, Toleration, and what best Means may be used against the Growth of Popery.' † It is not my intention to go into long extracts, but it is just to show you how he treats the subject. Listen to what follows :

"Let us now enquire whether Popery be tolerable or no. Popery is a double thing to deal with, and claims a twofold power, Ecclesiastical and Political, both usurpt, and the one supporting the other.....

"But Ecclesiastical is ever pretended to Political....Whether therefore, it be fit and reasonable, to tolerate men thus principled in religion towards the State, I submit it to the consideration of all magistrates, who are best able to provide for their own, and the

* Works, fol. ad. 1751. p. 226.

† Vol. v. p. 406. Ed. 1850.

public safety. As for tolerating the exercise of their religion, supposing their state activities not to be dangerous, I answer that toleration is either public or private; and the exercise of their religion, as far as it is idolatrous, can be tolerated neither way.... Having shown thus, that Popery as being idolatrous, is not to be tolerated either in public or private; it must be now thought how to remove it, and hinder the growth thereof, I mean in our natives, and not foreigners, privileged by the law of nations. Are we to punish them by corporal punishment, or fines in their estates, upon account of their religion? I suppose it stands not with the clemency of the gospel, more than what appertains to the security of the state. But first we must remove their idolatry, and all the furniture thereof, whether idols, or the mass wherein they adore their God under bread and wine.... If they say that by removing their idols, we violate their consciences, we have no warrant to regard conscience which is not grounded on Scripture.... Shall we condescend to dispute with them? The Scripture is our only principle in religion; and by that only they will not be judged, but will add other principles of their own, which, forbidden by the Word of God, we cannot assent to. And the common maxim also in *Logic* is, *against them who deny principles we are not to dispute.*'''*

Our readers are probably aware that Milton would tolerate Socinians, because they profess to receive part of their doctrines from scripture, and his treatise on this subject shews that the civil magistrate must not interfere with Protestant conscience.

“‘No Protestant, therefore, of what sect soever following Scripture only, which is the common sect wherein they all agree, and the granted rule of everie man’s conscience to himself, ought, by the common doctrine of Protestants, to be forced or molested for religion. But as for poperie and idolatrie, why, they also may not hence plead to be tolerated. I have much less to say. The religion the more considered, the less can be acknowledged a religion; but a Roman principalitie rather endeavouring to keep up her old universal dominion, under a new name, and meer shaddow of a Catholic religion, being indeed more rightly named a catholic heresie against the Scripture; supported mainly by a civil, and except in Rome, by a foreign power: justly therefore to be suspected, not tolerated, by the magistrate of another countrey. Besides, of an implicit faith, which they profess, the conscience also becomes implicit, and so by voluntarie servitude to man’s law, forfeits her Christian libertie. Who, then, can plead for such a conscience, as being implicitly enthralled to

* Ib. p. 412-414.

man instead of God, almost becomes no conscience, as the will not free, becomes no will. Nevertheless if they ought not to be tolerated, it is for just reason of state, more than of religion; which they who force, though professing to be Protestants, deserve as little to be tolerated themselves, being no less guiltie of poperie in the most popish point.* There is a doctrine of toleration! to be learned from one of the great authors whom the young men of Exeter Hall are advised by the noble lord to consult, in order to know that toleration which was ardently desired by one, and established by the other."

The Cardinal proceeds to consider Lord John's general commendation of Milton, whom his Lordship describes as a "good and great man," and the reading of whose works is pointed out as "a great step in moral improvement."

"In the noble lord's lecture there is a passage about free discussion; everything is to be discussed, every body is to discuss, with the Bible in his hand; and thus truth is to be found. Was Milton in favour of free discussion; did he allow that even different denominations of Protestants, who had a common sect—as he called it—should be allowed to discuss their differences? How differently he speaks; he does allow discussion indeed, but how? 'They pretend it would unsettle the weaker sort; the same groundless fear is pretended by the Romish clergy in prohibiting the Scripture. At least let them have leave to write in Latin which the common people understand not; that what they hold may be discussed among the learned only.'† Discussing in Latin! There the young men of Exeter Hall may see what Milton wished that the dissenting clergy of every denomination should write in Latin. I think it would be the richest collection of Latin literature the world has ever seen. But if the young men of Exeter Hall procure Milton's works, they will be struck not only with the magnificence of his style, but with certain doctrines which the noble lecturer never intended they should be familiar with. There is a strong appeal in the lecture to the memory of Latimer and Ridley, and their martyrdom is brought forward as a crime against society; how does Milton speak of them? 'And heerewithal I invoke the *Immortal Deitie, Revealer and Judge* of secrets, that wherever I have in this book plainly and roundly spoken worthily and truly, laid open the faults and blemishes of *Fathers, Martyrs, or Christian Emperors*; or have otherwise inveighed against error and superstition with vehement expressions: I have done it neither out of malice, nor list to speak evill, nor any vain-glory; but of mere necessity, to vindicate the spotless truth from an ignominious bondage, whose native worth is now become

* Ib. p. 317.

† Ib. p. 417.

of such low esteeme, that shee is like to finde small credit with us for what she can say, unlesse shee can bring a ticket from *Cranmer*, *Latimer*, and *Ridley* ; or prove herselfe a retainer to *Constantine*, and weare his *badge*. More tolerable it were for the *Church of God* that all these names were utterly abolished, like the *Brazen Serpent* ; then that men's fond opinion should thus idolize them, and the heavenly *Truth* be thus captivated.* And in another place he says, ' If their religion is thus consecrated by their martyrdom, perhaps their rebellions were consecrated by their treason ;' he treats them therefore as no better than traitors, who tried to overturn the monarchy. There is the judgment of Milton upon these men. But then his Episcopacy : I can understand the young men of America being much edified by finding treatise after treatise upon the corruptions of Protestant prelacy ; and these are some of the most splendid passages in his works ; and in reading them you are captivated by the richness of the style, and the energy of the declamation, though the expressions are such as I can scarcely read here. But to English youth, will any one recommend such expressions as these, who pretends to be an Episcopalian ? ' But what doe we suffer mis-shapen and enormous *Prelatisme*, as we do, thus to blanche and varnish her deformities with the faire colours, as before of *martyrdom*, so now of *Episcopacie* ? They are not *bishops*, God and all good men know that they are not, that have filled this land with late confusion and violence ; but a tyrannical crew and corporation of impostors, that have blinded and abused the world so long under that name.' "

We omit for want of space, some further quotations from Milton, which nevertheless are most effectively introduced by the eminent lecturer. Their tendency, however, may be gathered from the sentence in which the Cardinal resumes the thread of his discourse.

" There is a passage to teach the young men of England, how their bishops are to be spoken of. It is a passage I should scarcely have read, except for the purpose of unmasking a dangerous direction given to the young men of this country. Is it not clear that although Milton may be a sublime poet, and one of the first writers in our literature, young men should be warned that, instead of his being an oracle of truth and light, his works contain that which is utterly at variance with what their catechism would teach them ? I could go further and quote a passage from his *Iconoclastes* in which he justifies the putting of the king to death, and says it

* " Of Reformation, touching Church Discipline in England," Lib. 2. Vol. iii. p. 9.

the nation might be proud. Are there any books which would give to the young men of this generation, a sufficient sprinkling of democratic and red-republican principles on every side? I think instead of works like these being read and recommended, it is a duty to caution and warn the scholar and the scholar may read them as an artist looks upon a master piece of work which he can understand, and which he can enjoy, in order to make himself acquainted with the beauties of literature. It is a book which no one would permit to be in a library intended to form young men in true, social, civil, and religious principles."

Our readers will perceive that our duty has been limited to a transcript of the more important passages of this admirable lecture. We should require the power of the lecturer himself to do justice to its very eloquent vindication of the Catholic cause. Its circulation appears to us to be of such great value and importance to all lovers of truth, that we cannot too strongly recommend it to our readers. And we close our remarks by transcribing its noble peroration.

"Nothing remains but exhorting you to cultivate every innocent advantage, under such guides as may secure against delusion. Read as much as you please, but let it be of books that will breed in you good thoughts, and lead you to virtue. Study science freely, without control,—go far into its discoveries, or such portions of it as you will. Make yourselves acquainted, if you please, and if your talents and inclinations lead you, with any branch of knowledge, or with all. Indulge in literature, so that you may have your minds filled with beautiful and with virtuous ideas, and enjoy at the same time cheerful recreation, which should always be associated with literary and scientific pursuits, lest the mind should be overburdened and oppressed. Thus you will develop your minds as much as those to whom there is also given further liberty in speculating on what is revealed. You, as Catholics, know the boundaries of faith, presume not to step beyond them. If doubt arise, if in the course of your reading, at any time there spring up in you anxieties, if you feel that there seems to be an incompatibility between what science unfolds, and what religion teaches, then seek and enquire, and ask from those who have studied before you, who have themselves, perhaps, had to pass through darkness and perplexity, you will find your doubts dissipated. Then, there are sources in the Church, in its devotions, its sacraments, and other means of grace, which will amply supply to you that inward light, that almost divine instinct, whereby a Catholic adheres to his faith steadily, and clasps it as firmly as the

mariner does the mast he has embraced, however he may be rocked about by the waves and the winds, among which the storm has dashed him.

“ It is thus that you will grow up good Christians, at the same time that you improve in every way, hopeful, and able to aid the progress of society, and to assist it in moral and political advancement, without loss or detriment to that which is far more precious than any amount of human knowledge or earthly wisdom. You have thus, amidst all that is changeable a rock which is immoveable. You know that however the pursuits of men may change their direction, and their course, and aspect, still the Church moves not from the rock on which it was planted. Still no passage of armies, no desolating flood, no time is sufficient to disturb it or destroy it. Thus you always have the light to your path, the direction to your steps. And in allusion to the great unchangeableness, and even immoveable character of catholic truth, and its durability, when all that is mere earthly shakes and is scattered and destroyed, I could quote to you that passage from Macaulay so well known to you all, which describes the Traveller from New Zealand, sitting on a broken arch of London Bridge, sketching the ruins of St. Paul’s, when the throne of St. Peter stands as firmly, and the power of the Popes exists as strong and as extended as ages ago, and as it is this day. But I prefer rather closing with an expression of this truth from a pen whence it could still less have been expected. It is a sonnet from Armellini, one of the Roman republican triumvirs, one of the three men who ruled the so called Roman republic when the Pope was driven from his throne. I will read it first in the sweet original Italian ; and then I will read a translation which I have ventured to make.

SONNET BY THE TRIUMVIR ARMELLINI.

Io mi scontrai col Tempo, e a lui ragione
 Chiesi di tante auguste moli e tante,
 Che fa d’Argo, di Tebe, e di Sidone ?
 E d’altre che fur appo e fiero innante ?
 E’rispondendo, invece di sermone
 Un cenere mostrò, di regi ammanti,
 E mille avanzi d’arme e di corone,
 Mille scheggie agitò di scettri infracti.
 Di quei che son, ragion gli chiesi ancora :
 Ei rotolò l’acciar che tullo rose,
 “ Cid che altri fur,” gridò, “ fian essi or, ora.”
 E chiedendo se il fin delle altre cose
 Avrà di Piero il Soglio ? Ei tacque. E allora,
 Del tempo invece, Eternità rispose.

TRANSLATION OF SIG. ARMELLINI'S SONNET.

Meeting old Time, the tale I bid him tell
 Of many noble piles in days goneby,
 "Where's Argos? Thebes? or Sidon? and where lie
 Who, after and before them, bore the bell?"
 He said no word; but showed me in his cell,
 Ashes of robes yet tinged with purple dye,
 And bits of crowns, and armour piled up high,
 With splints of shattered sceptres mixed pell-mell.
 Of such things, which yet are, I asked the fate.
 His all-destroying scythe around he plied,
 And shrieked: "Past empires present ones await."
 Then asked I: "Does the same decree abide
 For Peter's throne?"—Time seemed his breath to bate,
 And spake not. For Eternity replied.

ART. IX.—1. *Christian Theism: the Testimony of Reason and Revelation to the Existence and Character of the Supreme Being.* By ROBERT ANCHOR THOMPSON, M.A. London: Rivingtons, Waterloo Place. 1855.


2. *Theism: the Witness of Reason and Nature to an All-Wise and Beneficent Creator.* By the Rev. JOHN TULLOCH, D.D. William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London. 1855.

THERE exists a popular, and, we dare say, a well-founded prejudice against prize-essays in general. A man sitting down to read one of these productions can hardly ever divest himself of a latent suspicion that it must, as a matter of course, approach to one of two extremes,—that it must either be somewhat superficial and school-boy like, or else be alarmingly heavy, formal and pedantic. The authors of the treatises before us have succeeded in avoiding both these extremes. The most learned student of metaphysics will not deem their treat-

ment of the great subject with which they have undertaken to deal, puerile or shallow; while at the same time it is competent to any reader acquainted with the mere rudiments of natural theology, to seize the meaning of almost every position maintained by both writers, and perceive the force and learning of the arguments by which they profess to defend it. Beyond this however, neither of the two essays is entitled to praise. Both are on the whole written with as much perspicuity as the subject would admit; both show that the writers have taken care to study, though not to master, some of the most important questions connected with metaphysics: and in this consists their chief, if not their only merit.

An Aberdeen merchant named Burnett, who died in 1784, bequeathed the fund out of which the successful writers of these essays are rewarded. The fund is applied but once in forty years;—such a long interval having been fixed upon probably with a view that the subject of the essays might be discussed in a manner suited to the intellectual wants of each generation of Scotch and English thinkers who may be exposed to the peril of falling into Atheism. The prizes are open to public competition. By a codicil added to Burnett's will in the last year of his life, the subject of the thesis for which the Philosophers of Great Britain are invited to compete stands thus: "That there is a Being all powerful, wise, and good; by Whom everything exists: and particularly to obviate difficulties regarding the Wisdom and Goodness of the Deity; and this in the first place from considerations independent of written Revelation, and in the second place from the Revelation of the Lord Jesus; and from the whole to point out the inferences most necessary for and most useful to mankind."

For the two best essays on this subject he appoints a sum exceeding sixteen hundred pounds. Three-fourths of this are to be given in reward of the essay that shall be judged to have most merit; the remaining fourth to be awarded to the writer of the treatise which shall be pronounced next in merit. The judges who are to decide upon the relative merits of the various essays that may be submitted for competition are by Burnett's will to be three in number; they are elected by the ministers of the Established Church of Aberdeen, the Principals and Professors of King's College and Mareschal College, Aberdeen, together



with the trustees of the testator. The three judges are required to make each a solemn public declaration that they will decide to the best of their ability according to the intention of the gentleman who founded the premium, and that in their arbitration they will not be influenced by prejudice or partiality. The judges on the late occasion were, Baden Powell, Henry Rogers, and Isaac Taylor. Their report was brought up before a meeting of the electors in the Town Hall of Aberdeen, Jan. 20, 1855. Two hundred and eight essays had been submitted for competition, and the two successful writers were declared to be Robert Anchor Thompson, M.A., for the first prize £1800.; and for the second £600. the Rev. John Tulloch, D.D., Principal of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews.

The following is an extract from the Report of the Judges:—"We, the Judges appointed for the Burnett prizes, in reporting to the Trustees the result at which we have arrived, feel it necessary first to state, that after giving careful examination to the whole of the Treatises sent in, we have found considerable difficulty in coming to a decision, not on account of any difference of opinion among ourselves, but on account of the very near approach to equality of merit in a considerable number of the Treatises. We should have been glad to find that there had been two Treatises so incontestably superior to the rest as to release us from all hesitation. Still though there is no Essay which, in our judgment, is not greatly capable of improvement, by omission or alteration (which we mention with reference to the future publication of such Essays); we are unanimously of opinion that there are *three* which stand by an appreciable interval in advance of the rest."

In bequeathing so considerable a sum of money for the foundation of two such premiums as those awarded to Mr. Thompson, and the Rev. Dr. Tulloch, (these premiums have amounted on the present occasion to £2400.) Mr. Burnett, we doubt not, was influenced by motives of charity and benevolence. His whole life seems to have been that of a well-disposed, though somewhat eccentric man. We are not unwilling, therefore, to acknowledge that the Aberdeen Merchant is entitled to such gratitude as a public benefactor deserves. There is sufficient reason to apprehend that faith in the supernatural has become entirely extinct; that the ideas of God, and of a future life have begun to fade from men's minds, or to be utterly

distorted: a generous effort to rectify an evil of such magnitude can scarce fail to elicit general sympathy and admiration. While, however, we are convinced that the late Mr. Burnett has conferred a real benefit upon his country, we may be permitted to regret that the country should stand in need of such a benefit. The two premiums for the best essays on the existence of God were not founded merely for the purpose of encouraging philosophical studies, or of stimulating intellectual competition; far from it: they were founded for a more serious and more important object. At the period of Mr. Burnett's death the current of infidelity which has since grown into a rapid and ever swelling flood, had set in, and begun to spread its poisoned waters over England and Scotland. Mr. Burnett himself, we are told, had learned to doubt, and could not be reconciled to any known form of christianity. It was with the intention of arresting the progress of infidelity, of not allowing the abyss to become a lower abyss, that the premiums alluded to were founded; and we believe there are few persons who will not acknowledge that the object was a most meritorious one. At the same time the reflection will probably suggest itself to some of our readers, that if the country had remained Catholic, if the great principle of private judgment had not been preached in England, if men had continued to submit to the authority of the Church in questions appertaining to faith, so munificent a donation might have been employed for purposes more advantageous to religion, and to society.

In the present number of our Review we are obliged to restrict our observations to a few notes suggested by the reading of the first, though we should venture to say, not clearly the best of these Treatises. We may hereafter take occasion to present our readers, if not with a detailed examination of the contents of both books, at least with an abstract of the arguments which Catholic writers advance on Christian Theism.

Mr. Thompson's Essay we have perused attentively, and after a most careful examination we confess ourselves at a loss to discover how it is at all justly entitled to be considered a treatise on the particular theme proposed for the Burnett prize. The writer himself informs us in the preface that though ultimately directed to meet the appointed thesis, it is in some parts founded on notes which had been made without this reference, and before he had heard of

the expected competition. For ourselves we could easily be persuaded that the chief part of the essay had been compiled from such desultory notes. We have tried in vain to make out the connection between the various chapters in these two volumes, or to discover their bearing on the subject under discussion. Each chapter considered separately we have succeeded in understanding; but the logical nexus, if such there be, which binds them together has entirely escaped us. Mr. Thompson has undoubtedly collected a large quantity of materials, not very rare, nor very precious; and many persons would add not very solid; but such as the materials are, he has thrown them all into a pile; and the most patient and critical examiner will, we fancy, find it difficult to characterise the style of the building which he has attempted to erect from them, or to see how the different portions of it can be supposed to constitute one harmonious whole. If Mr. Thompson had undertaken to adduce a number of distinct and independent arguments in support of his thesis, we should perhaps have had occasion to be less surprised at this apparent want of unity and coherence in his essay. But no; he peremptorily, and in our judgment in a rather arbitrary fashion, discards all the usual arguments on the subject, and professes to rest his thesis exclusively on the argument from Design. At least so we understand him; for in truth it is extremely difficult to assign the portion or portions of his book in which there is any direct positive argument whatever to prove the existence of the Deity. At all events the confusion, and marked irrelevancy of which we have taken notice in Mr. Thompson's Treatise, are not the results of the multifarious array of arguments by which he would demonstrate his thesis. In fact he seems to have made rather copious notes on a variety of metaphysical subjects, before he had addressed himself to the immediate topic proposed for the Burnett prize; and probably he thought that these notes were too valuable and too interesting to be excluded even from a treatise with which they could scarcely have any legitimate connection.

Mr. Thompson's account of the various systems which have been proposed in the history of speculation to explain the origin of our knowledge, is the most uninviting and indeed the most purposeless we have ever read. For what class of readers has it been intended? Not surely for those who are mere hospites in the study of mental philoso-

phy, and who have not yet mastered its alphabet. For them it is absolutely useless, because unintelligible. Nor can this poor synopsis have been seriously designed for the instruction of men who have themselves been at the pains of ever devoting a single half hour's attention to the matter discussed; for a half hour's reading of any respectable Catholic publication on the same subject would afford double the amount of knowledge to be derived from this lucky prize-essay.

Among other systems to account for the origin of our knowledge, Mr. Thompson refers to the Idealism of Berkeley; and by the reference shows pretty clearly that his acquaintance with the writings of the great Irish philosopher was not much more intimate or extensive than with the works of Leibnitz or Descartes. He leads us to infer that it is in Berkeley's *Principles of Human Knowledge* we are to look for a formal evolution of Berkeley's theory of Idealism; and he makes no more allusion to the *Three Dialogues* than if they had never been published: the fact being that in the former treatise the theory of Idealism is but incidentally referred to, while in the latter work alone, which appeared three years after the *Principles of Human Knowledge*, we have the system elaborately propounded and maintained. The following is Mr. Thompson's deliberate verdict upon Idealism:—"No reasoning can confute it, nor prove it to be impossible in the nature of things. It is quite conceivable that our life in the world may be not a reality, but a dream of which the figures and visions are represented according to certain rules and unchanging laws, by the agency of a superior Being." We should be very slow to admit that the position of the Idealist is so impregnable as Mr. Thompson represents it. We hold that it is as capable of being refuted as any other absurd theory which has appeared in the history of speculation; and that the assertion made by our essayist to the effect that "our life in the world may be not a reality but a dream," is as opposed to the principles of christian Theism, as to those of sound philosophy. If Mr. Thompson, before composing his treatise, had been at the pains of reading the dissertations appended to Sir William Hamilton's edition of Reid, he would scarce have retained his present sentiments of reverence towards Idealism.

The account which Mr. Thompson has given us of the various speculative "theories of existence," will to the

metaphysician, appear one of the most interesting passages in the work. Of the theories of existence we shall briefly indicate the most obvious, and then examine such as are commonly made the basis of infidelity. The possible theories may be divided into four classes, and these again into several distinct systems. They may be represented as follows.—I. Atheism, which assigns independent existence 1, to self, or the mind ; 2, to the material world ; 3, to both the mind and matter ; 4, to neither of them ; which is Nihilism.—II. Pantheism ; which professes to acknowledge an eternal, self-existent Being ; but either, 1, identifies its good with the known universe ; or, 2, makes mind and matter to be necessary evolutions and inseparable parts of the divine nature.—III. Spurious Theism, which attributes independent existence to God, together with self-existent spirits—self-existent matter—self-existent spirits and matter.—IV. Monotheism which affirms the existence of One God, of Infinite Power, Wisdom and Goodness, by Whom all things exist. It becomes Christian Theism when its view of the Divine Character is consistent with that exhibited in Revelation.

Of these conceivable systems Mr. Thompson undertakes to review the first and second for the purpose of refuting them ; the vindication of the fourth forms the main object for which his treatise professes to have been written. The third theory he deems it unnecessary to deal with ; it has seldom appeared outside the mythology of Egypt, and the speculations of the Gnostics ; and at present there is little danger of its revival. The author, therefore, restricts himself to a confutation of Atheistic Idealism, Atheistic Materialism, and Pantheism.

A systematic exposition and refutation of these theories would be a most valuable addition to our English philosophical literature. At the present day it would be difficult to overstate the importance of such refutation. It is very generally said, and we fear that there is little reason to question the accuracy of the statement, that in England and Scotland, where the people are not Catholic, faith is waning fast ;—faith in God and in a future life ; and that its light may soon go out for ever. The universities are represented as hot-beds of infidelity ; and the *Edinburgh Review* is positive in asserting that the poison has extended to the lowest ranks of the working order. We do not believe that the ablest and most convincing essay that

could be written in favour of Christian Theism could supply the true and effective antidote for this evil. For this unholy feeling of indifference, or scepticism, or infidelity is not to be removed or counteracted merely by arguments addressed to the intellect, or by the publication of metaphysical treatises, however learned and profound. What can the infidel mechanics and labourers, for example, whom Mr. Thomson speaks of, understand of such treatises? The root of the evil, at least in many instances, lies less deep; it is to be found in the moral perversity, the tendency to make this world the All; the habitual disregard for, rather than the denial of, the supernatural; the undivided homage given to mammon, as if mammon were the only supreme; the disposition to discard divine Providence from the conduct of human affairs; the unsettled state of opinion even among those who in the English Church are looked to as the fountains of orthodoxy. It is a kind of practical Atheism which is daily taking deeper and deeper hold of the English mind, that principally occasions and best explains the diffusion of many impious theories concerning the fundamental truths of natural religion.

At the same time there is doubtless a large class of readers in England and Scotland, men in some respects like Mr. Burnett himself, who would derive important benefit from an able exposition of the subject treated of in the essays before us. Even the negative mode of treatment on which Mr. Thompson principally dwells, namely, a refutation of the great systems opposed to Christian Theism, would if successful, be of the utmost utility. We cannot, however, congratulate the author on the degree of success which he has attained. His work is too learned and abstruse for mere popular reading; while those who will not be satisfied with anything short of a profound and searching investigation of the metaphysical topics introduced in it, will at once perceive that Mr. Thompson's avowed ignorance even of the standard philosophical writings published in his own country, not to speak of contemporary speculation on the continent, disqualifies him for such a task.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

I.—*Geology: Its Facts and its Fictions; or, the Modern Theories of Geologists contrasted with the Ancient Records of the Creation and the Deluge.* By W. ELFE TAYLER. London: Houlston and Stoneman, 1855.

When this book was first announced we confess that we looked for its appearance with considerable anxiety. However, when we saw the volume, a small duodecimo, not containing more letter-press than a good sized pamphlet, and when we read its extensive and magniloquent title, we could not help exclaiming,

“Quid dignum tanto feret hic promissor hiatu?”

The author faithfully adheres to the division indicated in the title-page. He first gives a rapid, and, considering his contracted space, a necessarily imperfect sketch of the great discoveries regarding the surface of the globe which have been already made by what may still be called the infant science of Geology. On this subject he truly remarks:—

“Previous to the rise of this interesting science, it was universally believed that the various solid portions of the globe,—clay, sandstone, chalk, slate, limestone, &c.,—had always existed in the state in which they are now found; that they were brought into existence by the *fiat* of the Almighty, when ‘the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy.’ Geology teaches us that this is a palpable mistake. It unfolds to our astonished gaze the secrets of the great laboratory of the creation; and affords unquestionable proofs that a large proportion of the materials which constitute the surface of the globe have acquired their present form in a gradual manner, and under a vast variety of circumstances.”

Mr. Tayler should have mentioned that the fossil remains found in stratified rocks were, before the introduction of the science of Geology, universally believed never to have belonged to any animated being, but to have been created by God exactly in the state in which they are now discovered. Fossils were then generally called *lusus*

naturæ,—learned words, by which modern philosophers cloaked their ignorance, as their more ancient brethren did theirs under the phrase *natura abhorret a vacuo*. The sciences of Hydrostatics and Pneumatics have not more clearly unveiled the empiricism which was concealed under these latter words, than that of Geology has exposed the ignorance hidden under the former. The bones and fossil remains are now proved, not only to have once formed a portion of animals and plants, but, moreover, the genera and species to which they belonged, though generally extinct, have, nevertheless, been determined with wonderful accuracy. The rocks in which such fossils are found, often in great abundance, are proved, therefore, to have been formed since these animals and plants lived upon the earth. The materials and the structure of the rocks themselves powerfully corroborate this position; and these are what Mr. Tayler calls the “facts of Geology.”

The geologists, however, infer, from the vast number of extinct species of plants and animals which are found embedded in rocks; from the widely different types they exhibit in the earliest formations, when compared with those which at present dwell upon the earth, as well as from the vast thickness of the stratified rocks themselves, in which no remains of man or of his works have yet been found, that the earth must have been first created by God far more than six thousand years ago. According to them, Moses relates first the original creation, and then immediately passes on to the period when God ordered His own work so as to make it a fit abode for man. Mr. Tayler labours, and we cannot help thinking very imprudently, to prove that this “fiction,” as he is pleased to call it, is alike inconsistent with the sacred narrative and with “geological facts.” On the first point he utterly fails, nor could it have happened otherwise, seeing that, according to his interpretation, the earth existed several days before the creation of the sun around which it revolves. With regard to the second point, he proves that Geologists have, on their own showing, fallen into many errors, which, however, they have retracted as soon as they discovered them to be such, and that they are still at variance on many important points. But all Mr. Tayler’s extracts—and his little volume is a mere collection of extracts—only show, what Geologists themselves openly proclaim, that the science is still in its

infancy, and that we may expect that many prevalent opinions and theories will be modified or refuted by future discoveries. But the leading inference from geological discoveries, that the formation of the stratified rocks has occupied an immense period of time, he leaves untouched. He merely revives the old and oft-refuted theory, which attributes everything to the Deluge; a theory so utterly untenable, that if he feels himself forced to choose between it and the *lusus naturæ* hypothesis, we advise Mr. Tayler to adopt the latter, and to put a new dress on those old fossils which have puzzled those predecessors of his, whose obsolete theories he is anxious to revive.

II.—*Ancient Ireland: her Milesian Chiefs; her Kings and Princes; her Great Men; her Struggles for Liberty; her Apostle St. Patrick; her Religion.* By Martin A. O'Brennan. Dublin, Mullany. 1855.

An interesting Irish poem, written by John O'Connell, a member of the family of the Liberator, and a Catholic Bishop of Kerry in the beginning of the eighteenth century, has furnished to the author of "Ancient Ireland," an occasion for putting together, in the form of notes, illustrations, and appendixes, a vast variety of curious and valuable learning, in every branch of Irish antiquities and Irish literature. His work is indeed a repository of Irish learning; and although, from the very nature of the work, the information is dispersed through the volume without much order, yet a copious Alphabetical Index places it within the reach even of the most hasty enquirer. Mr. O'Brennan's work may serve as, in some sense, an Irish Antiquarian Manual.

III.—*The Discourse delivered at the Opening of the Second Provincial Synod of Oscott.* By the RIGHT REV. BISHOP ULLATHORNE. London, Dublin, and Derby, Richardson and Son.

The Bishop inaugurates the Synod of 1855 by marking the twofold view of its functions; its utility in the human aspect, and on the supernatural side, "the venerableness of authority, the efficacy of influence, the fruitfulness of order;" and that especial promise of divine assistance, recognized in the opening prayer for the occasion. These things make Synods, not merely an expedient, but a

necessary condition of the Church's normal existence and healthy action. Hence their definition:—"A Synod is a sublime communion in the gifts of the Holy Ghost for the ruling of the Church." The especial reference to Synods borne by the promise, "Where two or three," &c. was early recognised by the Council of Chalcedon, and has been, on many other equally solemn occasions, similarly appropriated by the Church. The Twelve, who individually possessed infallible knowledge as rulers, as well as infallible authority, yet met in deliberative assembly, at once diocesan, provincial, and œcumenical. The repeated injunctions of general councils, and all the weight of saints' and doctors' teaching, not less than the voice of experience, go to enforce that primæval Apostolic Canon which requires bishops to meet, at no long intervals, in provincial synod. St. Charles of Milan attributed all the corruptions of his period, of which he was the angelic reformer, to the decay of synods. Bellarmine declared them altogether essential to the good government of the Church. England's great defection of the sixteenth age was but the sequel and climax of a long period of synodical torpor. So was it too in Germany; and again in France, nearer our own time, the disuse of synods brought in the desolation of her Church. The bishop eloquently unfolds, with the loving skill of an adept, the exquisite mechanism of this part of the Church's organization, and concludes by pointing out its perfect adaptation by the favour of God and our Immaculate Lady to purify and elevate the godless civilization of this age.

IV.—*The Immaculate Conception*: an Essay. By the Rev. MICHAEL TORMEY, Professor in the Roman Catholic Seminary, Navan. Dublin: Duffy. 1855.

Mr. Tormey's Essay is a judicious and well-timed contribution to our popular theological literature. It is written with great taste and simplicity, and condenses into a small compass all the really important arguments, both from Scripture and tradition, in defence of the great doctrine which, during the past twelve months, has employed so many minds, whether in reverent acceptance or in sceptical criticism. To both classes we earnestly recommend this short but pregnant essay.

V.—*The Spiritual Doctrine of Father Louis Lallemant.* Edited by F. W. FABER, D.D. London : Burns and Lambert, 1855.

Father Louis Lallemant was one of the most eminent masters of Direction among the many whom the Society of Jesus has produced. His work, now translated into English, was originally published under the title of *Accueil des Maximes*, as an appendix to his life by the Pere Champion. It was afterwards thrown into the form in which we now find it, and appeared as a separate publication. F. Lallemant may be described as one of the most practical of the mystic writers of his generation ; and indeed the minuteness of the details of his practical system is one of the defects imputed to him by those who have criticised its utility.

Nevertheless, there is unction about all that he has written ; there is life in the most dry and mechanical details of his spiritual direction ; there is solid sense in the most abstract views of the spiritual life in which he indulges ; and these make his work at once a manual of the higher spirituality, and a popular book of instruction even for the merest tyro in the ascetic life.

VI.—*Jesus Christ the Model of the Priest.* From the Italian. London, Dublin, and Derby : Richardson and Son.

A most beautiful translation, and one that will no doubt be very acceptable to our clergy. The instructions are given in the person of our Lord, which of course gives them a most solemn effect. We transcribe a passage as a specimen of the work :—

“In the culture of souls take care, especially, not to show partiality by acceptation of persons.....What must be said of those among My ministers who find neither time nor place for instructing the *pocr*, but find both for the great and rich ? If a rich man comes, any occupation is cut short, and an inconvenient hour is judged convenient. But if a poor person comes for spiritual counsel, then too readily such priests will say they are engaged, they cannot come.Never let the world's measure enter into My sanctuary.”

Probably our clergy are as free from this reproach as those of any country in the world.

VII.—*One More Return from Captivity ; or, My Submission to the Catholic Church Vindicated and Explained.* By the REV. EDMUND S. FOULKES, B.D., Late Fellow and Tutor of Jesus College. London : Burns and Lambert, 1855.

The reader will probably remember a Manual of Ecclesiastical History which formed the subject of some strictures in this Journal about four years since. The author of that Manual, although far in advance of ordinary Protestant historians, had yet formed to himself a theory of primitive history irreconcilable with the modern pretensions of Rome. Into his conclusions on many of the facts of early history, especially the Paschal controversy, the Rebaptizing Controversy, the Cyprianic Letters, &c., we entered at some length, at that occasion, with the purpose of showing that he had chosen an untenable halting-place, and that the historical evidences, by the light of which he had advanced so far beyond his co-religionist historians, should have necessitated a complete and unreserved recognition of the claim of Roman Supremacy.

It has pleased Divine Providence to bring about, in its own mysterious course, a complete change of Mr. Foulkes' view of the Papal Supremacy. But it is a curious illustration of the variety of ways in which the same result may be produced in different minds, that, as far as we can judge from the very interesting little pamphlet now before us, the author's views of the special facts to which we refer remain unaltered, while seemingly by an application of the theory of Development, his inferences from the whole course of the general history have undergone a complete reversal.

We abstain from entering further into the questions which his modest and touching statement suggests. But we cannot deny ourselves the gratification of recording that he ascribes his own change of view, as well as that of two other friends to whom he alludes, to the recent admirable work of Archdeacon Wilberforce, in which he records the process of his own conversion.

VIII.—*The Chain of Fathers, witnesses for the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God.* By F. C. HUSENBETH, D.D. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.

The Provost of Northampton truly remarks, that “the 8th of December, 1854, will ever be a memorable day in the annals of the Church of Christ.” The object of his pamphlet is “to show the falsity of the statement which has gone forth to the world, that the Fathers have declared unanimously that the Blessed Virgin was conceived in original sin.” Dr. Husenbeth shows, by quotations from Origen to S. Bernard (duly authenticated by references), that their language respecting her necessarily implied the immaculate conception;—proving, also, that S. Bernard’s objection to the observance of a new festival was made on the ground of *irregularity* only; and that he would joyfully have accepted the recent decision, put forth, as it has been, by the highest authority. This is a most opportune publication, and calculated to be useful both to Catholics and Protestants. With this little work, and those of Cardinal Lambruschini, the Bishop of Birmingham, and the author of “*The Eighth of December*” (containing an account of the recent definition, with the dogmatic bull in Latin and English), the devout Catholic will possess a little armoury on this subject, which will enable him to repel all attacks. Even Martin Luther was constrained to acknowledge how fitting it was that the Mother of Christ should never be the subject of the devil.

IX.—1. *Manual of the Confraternity of La Sulette.* By the Rev. JOHN WYSE. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son. 1855.

2.—*The Conversion of M. Marie Alphonse Rattisbonne.* Edited by the Rev. W. LOCKHART. London: Burns and Lambert. 1855.

3.—*Manual of the Third Order of St. Francis.* London: Burns and Lambert, 1855.

¶ We acknowledge under one common head the first and second of these interesting little volumes, because the events out of which they have respectively arisen possess a kindred interest for the Catholic mind. It is through the medium of such works as these, reverent and yet calm in their tone, that we desire to see all similar subjects proposed for the devotional consideration of the faithful.

The beautiful little “*Manual of the Third Order of St. Francis*,” forms a most fit and appropriate companion volume.

X.—*The Music (with the words) of the Hymns, Anthems, and Litanies intended for the use of the Confraternities of La Salette.* Edited by the Rev. John Wyse. London, Dublin, and Derby : Richardson and Son.

This work will be very acceptable to the clients of our Lady of La Salette in England ; and the music appears to be of a solemn and church-like character, which cannot be said of all modern music. We believe the name of Mr. Wyse is a guarantee in this respect ; and we have much pleasure in recommending his useful work. The author of one of the little books we have noticed observes that the authorised music of the church “ seems to be founded upon the view, that the simplest medium of Divine accents is the best suited to their intrinsic majesty and sacredness, precluding as it does the very possibility of display.”

XI.—*The Crimea: its Ancient and Modern History.* By the Rev. Thomas Milner, M. A. 8vo. London, Longmans, 1855.

Mr. Milner's is one of the first contributions to the history and topography of the Crimea, to which the interest of the present campaign has given occasion. It does not pretend to the character of completeness, and there can be little doubt, that at least for the modern portion, it will soon be superseded by the more vivid and more real sketches, of the actual visitors or actors in the struggle, of which the peninsula is now the scene. Nevertheless, it is the work of a scholar and an accomplished writer, and for the ancient history of the Crimea, as well as for the general characteristics of its population and government, it leaves little to be desired.

XII.—*The Catholic Statesman : A Tribute to Frederick Lucas, Esq., M.P., with a notice of his Life and Public Career.* Dedicated (by permission) to the Provost of Westminster. London, Dublin, and Derby : Richardson and Son.

The author of the above little book was probably not mistaken in thinking that a brief outline of the life of our late great statesman would be “ acceptable to many Catholics.” It contains a great deal of interesting matter (including Canon Oakeley's beautiful sermon at the pro-

Cathedral of Westminster); not the least important of which is the very kind letter to Mr. Lucas from the Cardinal Archbishop, which has been copied into the papers from this little work. His Eminence wrote as follows in forwarding his contribution to the Lucas testimonial of last year:—"In every religious question which has come before parliament, whether it related to England, Ireland, the Colonies, or the Continent, Mr. Lucas has always been at his post, and ready to defend the Catholic cause."—p. 19, note. And many other illustrious prelates have expressed themselves to the same effect. The work has an appropriate frontispiece (an excellent specimen of a correct mortuary paper), and it contains autographs of Pius IX. and Cardinal Wiseman.

XIII.—*The Benefit of Christ's Death*. Probably written by Aonio Paleario. Reprinted in fac-simile from the Italian Edition of 1543. Together with a French Translation printed in 1551, to which is added an English version made in 1548, by Edward Cambray, Earl of Devonshire. Edited by CHURCHILL BABINGTON, B.D. London: Bell and Daldy. 1855.

Mr. Babington's volume is interesting as a literary curiosity. The original Italian work was first printed about the year 1540, and shortly afterwards being placed in the index of prohibited books, was so vigorously and so effectually suppressed, that, according to Ranke, "although many thousands were disseminated, it entirely disappeared, and is no longer to be found." Mr. Macaulay, in his own characteristically emphatic manner affirms, "that, although it was many times reprinted and was eagerly read in every part of Italy, the Inquisitors having detected in it the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith alone, proscribed it, and it is now as hopelessly lost as the second Decade of Livy."

It was translated into French, English, Croatian, and Spanish; but, by the same strange fortune, was believed to have equally disappeared in all these versions. The researches of the curious, however, have discovered the original, as also the English and French versions; and Mr. Babington has reprinted all three with great care, and as far as possible in fac-simile.

As a specimen of typography the volume is a very beautiful one. Its singular history has elevated it into a great bibliographical curiosity. But beyond this it has little other

value. As a polemical treatise, it is worthless in our days ; and, even historically, it proves little beyond the fact, that in Italy in 1540 there was an author who had some sympathies with *one view* of the Lutheran doctrine of justification.

XIV.—*The Catholic Almanack and Guide to the Service of the Church, for the Year of Grace, 1856.* (Cum permissu Card. Archiep.) London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.

We have here (for a penny) an historical notice of Westminster Abbey ; the Catholic statistics of England and the world ; the Archbishops and Bishops of the United Kingdom, the Colonies, and France ; the dignitaries of the Papal court, besides the other usual matter, and a variety of secular information. The same Catholic Calendar may be had interleaved and illustrated (by Pugin, Doyle, &c.), and with a most beautiful frontispiece, evidently allusive to the *Quarant' Ore*, or Forty Hours Devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, which it is to be hoped will soon overspread England, as it has already done the metropolitan diocese. The cover has a little print of S. Edward, one of the royal founders of Westminster abbey, of which an historical sketch is given. "Old abbey of a thousand vicissitudes," says Balines, "of fairy-like architectural decorations, of innumerable chapels, of ancient tombs, all stamped with the impress of ages ! You still tell the traveller what you once were, when you preserved unbroken the teaching of Augustine and the faith of S. Edward." The same book may also be had in a pocket-book form.

XV.—*Elements of Psychological Medicine.* By Daniel Noble, M. D. 8vo. London, Churchill, 1855.

The more humane and scientific treatment of the insane is one of the most notable steps in social progress which mark the present age. To have brought men to regard insanity as a disease at all—to have aroused them from the feeling of half terror, half impotence, with which they had traditionally regarded it, was in itself a great advance. To have reduced its treatment, as a disease, to the ordinary rules of the medical art,—a treatment based on the twofold character of the disease, mental and bodily, and on

the principles of Psychology as well as those of Physiology, is the triumph of modern science.

Dr. Noble's treatise is a careful digest of all the best and most modern views upon the subject. It would be out of place in this Journal to allude to its strictly professional details; but there is hardly a chapter of the work which is not full of most curious and interesting general information on this painful, but yet most important subject. His distribution of insanity into three varieties,—emotional, notional, and intelligential, affords opportunity for a profusion of most curious illustrative details, fully as interesting to the student of psychology as to the medical practitioner; and the facts and cases referred to in the chapters on the "Prognosis," the "Diagnosis," and the "Etiology" of Insanity, are among the most interesting we ever remember to have read.

XVI.—*The Autobiography of a Beggar-boy.* London: W. Tweedie, 337, Strand.

This autobiography is well written, and is dedicated to Charles Dickens, as a tribute for "his services in the cause of humanity." It will possess an interest for all who have hearts to feel for our wretched English poor, whose miseries it is always difficult to realise at comfortable firesides, and with abundance of food and clothing at our disposal.

XVII.—*Print and Biographical Notice of S. Hugh of Lincoln, Patron of the Diocese of Nottingham.* (Cum permissu Epi. Nottinghamensi.) London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.

This little sketch of the great and good Bishop of Lincoln (to whom the cathedral is much indebted), is from the pencil of the lamented architect of Nottingham Cathedral, of which diocese S. Hugh is the patron; and the biographical notice is brief but interesting. It will make a suitable book-mark for works of devotion, and will probably be used, as such in that diocese at least, which (we may observe) contains within its limits the Derby Catholic press.

XVIII.—*The Catholic Church, before and after Conversion.* A Lecture, by FREDERICK OAKELEY, M. A. London : Shean, 1855.

Mr. Oakeley thus strikingly introduces his subject :

“I have met with an illustration, I think in one of Cardinal Wiseman’s works, which admirably expresses the difference between the Catholic Church as she appears to those outside her pale, and to those who have been admitted within it. It is that of a painted window as seen from without and from within the sacred building which it adorns. To the external observer it presents nothing but a confused mass, without distinctness of outline or variety of colour. From within, on the contrary, all appears orderly and beautiful. The mass develops into a religious subject ; the dingy hue clears up into colours of the most surpassing brilliancy, and the most precious composition, which are reflected in rainbow tints upon the marble pavement beneath them. There was, even from without, a certain shadowing forth—a dim augury —of the glories within ; but to those alone who have passed the threshold does the work reveal its wonders, or even disclose its significancy. It is thus that the Church of Christ must be entered, in order to be understood and appreciated.”

His treatment of the entire subject, the terseness and vigour with which he has wrought out the contrast, the skill with which he has seized upon the strongest and most striking points, the beauty and appropriateness of his illustrations ;—all these are qualities so familiar to every one who knows Mr. Oakeley’s writings, that it would be almost trifling with our readers to allude to them. But we prize far above them all the thorough identification with the spirit of the Church, and the profound and tender appreciation not alone of all that is most striking and impressive, but also of all that is lowliest and most commonplace in her ritual, her worship, and her whole practical system which may be traced in every line of this most touching and instructive Lecture.

XIX.—*The Whole Evidence against the Claims of the Roman Church.* By Sanderson Robins, M. A. London, Longmans, 1855.

Any one who takes the trouble to read *The whole Evidence against the Claims of the Roman Church*, will be forced to confess that that “whole” is very little indeed. The writer has made the, even for his own pur-

pose, fatal mistake of attempting too much. He tries to compress into a single volume half-a-dozen subjects, the proper treatment of any one of which would require as much space as he has devoted to the entire. The result is, an overgrown pamphlet—a confused, flimsy, superficial, but withal, violently partisan, compendium of all the ordinary anti-papal writers on the various topics of popular controversy in relation to the authority of the Pope and of the Church.

If this be really “the whole evidence,” we shall not fear the result.

XX.—(1) *The Miser. Ricketicketack.* Two Tales. By Hendrik Conscience. London, Lambert and Co., 1855.

(2) *The Curse of the Village.* Lambert and Co.

(3) *Tales of Old Flanders.* By Hendrik Conscience.

(4) *Veva; or the War of the Peasants.* By Hendrik Conscience.

(5) *The Lion of Flanders.* By Hendrik Conscience.

Hendrik Conscience, with the instinct of true genius, has devoted himself to the illustration of the history and the social characteristics of his native country; and the success of his works among his own people, is an evidence of their merit and their truthfulness, which it is impossible to mistake. A few of his minor tales were translated into English, and formed the subject of notice in this Journal several years since. The opinions which we then expressed, are more than borne out by the volumes of the pretty series of his tales now before us. While they are thoroughly natural in their tone, they are, nevertheless, true to those general realities of nature and of life, which must be the foundation of all fiction. “Ricketicketack” is the very embodiment of simple natural beauty.

We may add, that, although there is not a word or an allusion in them which could offend the most scrupulous delicacy, M. Conscience’s writings are lively and humorous in the highest degree; and that his tales abound in all those incidents which are commonly supposed to be indispensable to the interest of a work of fiction. In purity and delicacy, his writings present a most pleasing contrast to the works of another novelist, in many respects not dissimilar, Auerbach, author of “Village Tales of the Black Forest,” the coarseness of whose later writings has bitterly

falsified the promise which his first publications seemed to hold forth.

XXI.—(1) *The Constitutional History of England*. By Henry Hallam, L. L. D. 3 vols., 8th edition. London, Murray, 1855.

(2)—*View of the State of Europe during the Middle Ages*. By Henry Hallam, L. L. D. 3 vols. 8vo. 11th edition. London, Murray, 1855.

There are few Protestant historians to whose pages we have so often had recourse for the purpose of vindicating or illustrating the social services of the Catholic Church, as those of Mr. Hallam. With a strong rationalistic bias, and an almost morbid impatience of all authority, whether religious or traditionary, in matters of opinion, he is, nevertheless, ready at all times fearlessly to admit the truth, no matter what may be its bearing upon his own religious views. And the readers of this Journal need not be informed, that there is hardly any modern English writer who has borne more unequivocal testimony to the merits and the services of the Church and the churchmen of the Middle Age,—testimony the more invaluable, indeed, from the very contrast which it presents to what he has written upon other subjects connected with Catholic Faith.

Nevertheless, Mr. Hallam is, in many respects, a very prejudiced writer; and, as soon as the beautiful and cheap edition of his collected works, now in course of publication, shall have been completed, we shall avail ourselves of an occasion which we have long desired, to offer some remarks upon the general character and tendency of his historical writings.

XXII.—1. *The Gospel Story Book: or Stories from the Lives of Jesus and Mary*. London: Burns and Lambert, 1855.

2. *Pictorial Bible Stories for the Young, on the Model of the Popular Bible Stories of Canon Schmid*. By the Editor of the Series of "Hymns and Songs for Catholic Families and Schools." Printed for the use of Poor Schools. Birmingham: 1855.

It is unnecessary for us to offer a word of recommendation on the subject of this most deserving project, or a word in praise of the admirable manner in which it has been so far carried out. Even if the charming volume now before us were not its own best eulogy, the popular name of Canon Schmid, and the well-known taste and

Mr. Faraby, would secure for it a warm welcome from every friend of Catholic education. It is alluding to it at all, therefore, is to urge those who are interested in elevating the religious and intellectual character of our poor, the necessity of engaging *actively* in this most meritorious scheme. It is a scheme which, from its very nature, can only be carried out successfully by the co-operation of many. Among the practical plans which have been suggested, a leading one consists in organizing a little system of "collecting weekly payments in small sums, by means of Christian Doctrine Teachers, pious ladies, and the like. The families of the poor spend annually an enormous sum in the purchase of printed trash of the worst description. If the Church's business is to remedy evils, here is an evil to be remedied. The remedy is to put attractive print in the way of the poor by small weekly payments; and find pious persons willing to busy themselves in collecting the small payments, and in supplying the books which these accumulated small payments have purchased."

With a view to the easy and effective organization of this plan, a card has been prepared for the purpose, which will be issued to those who may desire to engage in the scheme. Feeling deep interest in its success, we cannot urge too strongly what we believe to be one of the very easiest and most ready plans for securing it.

We avail ourselves of the same opportunity of recommending to our young readers the simple and excellent *Gospel Stories*, still more recently issued by Messrs. Burns and Lambert. They are tenderness and simplicity itself.

XXIII.—1. *Familiar Fables, in Easy Language, suited to the Juvenile Mind.* By MISS CORNER. Illustrated by Alfred Crowquill and James Northcote. London: Dean and Son, 1855.

2. *The Little Play of Mother Goose.* Edited by MISS CORNER. With Illustrations. London: Dean and Son.

3. *Puss in Boots.* By MISS CORNER. With illustrations. London: Dean and Son.

Miss Corner's popular name is a sufficient guarantee for the tastefulness of these pretty little volumes; and we need only add, that the style of illustration, and the excellence of the typography, are in keeping with the already established reputation of the enterprising publishers.

XXIV.—*History of France.* By E. DE BONNECHOSE. (Translated.)
London : Routledge.

This is (we are informed on the title-page) a work approved by the "Royal Council of Public Instruction." We are sorry for it. It was only on this account that we have drawn attention to the book. The reasons for our sorrow that it should be approved of by the "Royal Council of Public Instruction," will be supplied by one or two specimens. We presume the phrase implies that the approval was under Louis Phillippe, who had M. Guizot for Prime Minister, and a system of "public instruction" established by him. This will amply account for the "approval" of such a semi-infidel work ; and a Protestant minister would no doubt heartily approve of such passages as the following. Speaking of the controversy between St. Bernard and Abelard, the author says : " Abelard struggled during the whole of his life against the dominant spirit of his age, which regarded as a culpable insurrection every effort of human reason that was not authorized by the Church. Several centuries passed away before a part of Europe" (i.e. we presume England and France,) "ventured to proclaim and admit the great principle of which Abelard was unable to procure the triumph, liberty of examination, and discussion on matters of conscience and faith." What this means is explained by a preceding passage, in which Abelard is described as desirous to "submit the Catholic dogma to analysis ;" and to this it is added, "that St. Bernard lived in an age when the faith of nations was so strong and *their reason so weak.*" This antagonism between reason and faith, (the basis of all infidelity, which perversely forgets that the highest effort of reason is to prove the necessity for faith,) is further revealed when the writer speaks of the Reformation with evident complacency as provoked by the abuses of the Church, and as having "communicated a great movement to the human mind, diffusing a critical and philosophical spirit." The Council of Trent is spoken of thus : "It slept so soundly," says Fra Paola, "that nobody knew whether it was alive or dead. At last, just previously to its dissolution, it decided some serious questions. The

bishops drew up canons which defined in an invariable manner the articles of the faith of the Catholics, (not the Catholic faith,) and *refused all concessions to the spirit of the times.*"

So it is represented as a grievance that an œcumenical council, assembled to define the Catholic faith, made no concessions to the spirit of the times, and defined the faith in an invariable manner! After this our readers will not be surprised to hear that the Jesuits are spoken of as preaching regicide and engaging in political intrigues; and of course the inference is obvious, that their expulsion from France was just and good; whereas any one whose mind was not perverted by infidel prejudices must know that their expulsion was a great proximate cause of the horrible Revolution produced by that "critical and philosophical" spirit which had resulted from the Reformation. Admirable book to be approved by a "Council of Public Instruction," in a country once Catholic! See what comes of a system of state education, established under Protestant auspices; for could it be otherwise? Could Protestants approve of works telling the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, in regard to history? Impossible. And this work is useful in showing the mendacious and mischievous spirit in which works of history approved by state authorities are sure to be written. It is the more to be lamented as a very slight degree of alteration would make the book unexceptionable.

XXV.—1. *Reculver: or the Two Sisters of Thanet.* London: C. Dolman.
2. *The Indian Princess.* A tale founded on fact. London: C. Dolman, New Bond Street.

The associations of "Thanet's pleasant isle," (to quote from the guide-books), must ever possess a charm for the Catholic; for its ecclesiastical recollections and venerable remains even exceed in interest the natural beauty of the "garden of England." If we proceed thither by water, the modest turrets of Reculver suggest recollections of the Christian and Catholic Ethelbert, who retired to this spot after giving up his palace at Canterbury to the Apostle of England and his little band of missionaries; and if by land, (which, of course, now means by *rail*), our attention is arrested by the venerable towers of Canterbury itself, and a thousand emotions are excited by the recollections of the

long line of our saintly and glorified pontiffs, many of whom were bound to the Holy See by similar ties to those of our present metropolitan. And though the city of St. Edward now possesses the dignity which S. Gregory conferred on Canterbury (having been transferred by his present successor in the Apostolic throne), we can never overlook the religious claims of the latter, whose very pavement is consecrated by the blood of our great martyr pontiff, S. Thomas, whose memory we so justly celebrate. Nor does Canterbury alone possess interest to the Catholic tourist. Everywhere are we reminded of ante-reformation days, when England was true to God and the Church, and carefully preserved the teaching of S. Augustine. His modern but beautiful church at Ramsgate no doubt attracts many to that spot; and in the decorations of the chancel we shall not fail to discover the arms of Canterbury, the metropolitan *pallium* (now conferred on Westminster's archbishop), a more appropriate representation for a Catholic church than for the carriage door of a Protestant archbishop.

The first little work at the head of our notice may be described as a metrical history of mediæval England, with many notes explanatory of the religious associations of Thanet, and the topographical allusions in the text; and the second (by the same authoress) is in prose, but less interesting than the former. We regret that duty compels us to add, that we cannot praise the literary excellence, or even the grammatical accuracy, of either publication.

XXVI.—*The Ballads of Ireland*. Collected and edited by EDWARD HAYES. 2 vols. Dublin: Fullarton. 1855.

Mr. Hayes has done a most meritorious work in putting together the scattered materials of this charming collection. It does not comprise, as at first sight might appear, the ancient native ballads of Ireland; the editor's sole object having been to collect together into one body, and thus to preserve, from the various chances to which materials of so fragmentary a character are exposed, all the scattered contributions to our ballad literature which the national movement of the last fifteen eventful years had called forth.

A large proportion of these beautiful ballads, therefore, will prove to be old and familiar acquaintances. But there is no lover of genuine poetry, whether Celt or stranger, who will not welcome so complete and so beautiful a collection.

XXVII.—*Catholic Legends.* A new collection, from the best sources. London : Burns and Lambert, 1855.

We cannot do better than let the unknown author of this charming little work speak for himself. He tells us that "The design with which these stories and anecdotes have been collected, has been to furnish a few examples of that peculiar beauty which is so intimately associated with the Catholic Church, and everything that proceeds from her. It is not pretended that the illustrations here given of the various types in which that beauty displays itself are more than their name imports; they are strictly 'legendary,' and may or may not be true as matters of actual fact. Undoubtedly they are substantially true, so far as being a representation not only of what in its nature may appear, and does appear, continually in the history of the mysterious intercourse between the visible and the invisible, but also as being founded on distinct and actual facts, all of whose details have not been sufficiently verified by critical investigation to entitle them to be ranked as historical..... Provided that due care is taken to impress upon the growing intelligence the true character and weight of these 'legends,' they will tend to feed the imagination with that nourishment which it ardently desires, and which it is most important to supply to it, in immediate connection with the realities of the invisible world, and not with purely secular romance and poetry alone." (Pref.) We could not have better explained the character and purpose of the work than in the foregoing words, every one of which has our sincere assent. We think that this "legendary lore," so holy in its picturesque wildness, so attractive and elevating to the fancy, holds a most important office in the training of the young. No doubt care is required to see that it contains nothing exaggerated or distorted; but these exquisite and well told stories will stand that test; we have read them with great pleasure, and can warmly recommend them.

XXVIII—1. *The Shipwreck, or, the Desert Island.* Dunigan : New York, 1854.

2. *Oramaika, an Indian Story.* Dunigan : New York, 1854.

3. *Genevieve of Brabant.* A Legend of the Middle Ages, by Canon Schmid. Duffy : Dublin, 1855.

Three Catholic Story books; a welcome addition to many a juvenile library, we doubt not; and the religious spirit and good feelings inculcated in all, are so unexceptionable that we should rejoice to see them there. Their literary merit is another affair. *The Shipwreck* is founded on the old story of the rich man and the basket-maker on a desert island. The prince and the peasant, of the present story, are young men, born on the same estate who have grown up in deadly enmity: the former has abused the power of his station, the latter on the island triumphs in his strength and dexterity; finally their hearts are touched and they become warm friends: there is much that is good in the idea, and it would have borne greater development, and to be handled in a firmer style. In the second story, love and murder, flights, escapes, conversions, controversy, furnish materials for a three vol-umed novel, but the incidents are feebly narrated in a rapid style: and the result is a somewhat prosy little book. Good Canon Schmid's story is in his usual style;—impossible incidents, recounted with the most naïf simplicity, a childlike innocence of plot, and a saintlike beauty of sentiments.

XXIX.—*Heroines of Charity.* With a preface by Aubrey de Vere, Esq. London : Burns and Lambert, 1854.

Where should the heroines of charity be found except in the Catholic Church? We have been struck by a remark in Chambers' Journal, where the writer describes, under the title of the "Dingy House," the establishment of the "little sisters of the poor." "In a conversation," he says, "with our conductress we could not bring her to admit that mere humanity had anything to do with it. The basis on which they proceed is simply that text in which Christ expresses His appreciation of those who give

a cup of cold water in His name." Thus quaintly does the worthy Protestant express the difference between benevolence and charity. Of the former much, thank Heaven, will be found in all communities; it is a high and good instinct of the human heart; but the latter with its peculiar attributes of tenderness and reverence, humility and self-abnegation, and personal service can be found only in the Catholic Church. The present work has given us in the Sisters of Vincenne, Jeanne Biscot, Mrs. Seton, and above in the "Little Sisters of the Poor," some such instances of this divine quality as fill us with astonishment and awe. Even a slight sketch of the history and labours of these holy women excites feelings of the deepest reverence. Other admirable lives are given not of canonized saints, but of noble French ladies, most of them living in a corrupt period of French history, which will be read, we are sure, with as much interest as advantage.

XXX.—*Eucharistica*; or a series of pieces, original and translated, on the Adorable Sacrament of the Eucharist, by the Most Rev. W. WALSH. Dunigan: New York.

Our transatlantic brethren are keeping pace with us, side by side, in all the difficulties of the Church. Reverently and powerfully to defend the great mystery of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, against the insolence of the sceptic, even more than against the doubts of the ignorant, is perhaps the most delicate task that can be assigned to a controversialist; requiring tact as well as learning. We need not say that there are few men more competent to the discharge of such a duty than the learned and pious archbishop, whose labours we now recommend to the Catholic public.

XXXI.—*The Golden Book of the Confraternities*. Published with the approbation of the Most Rev. John Hughes, D.D., Archbishop of New York. Dunigan, 1854.

There is nothing new in this little work; but it contains a great deal of information, which we are glad to find collected. It gives us, with their histories and rules, the indulgences attached to the different associations, into some one or more of which, so many of the Christian

world are now enrolled, with all the particulars which it is necessary to know, in order properly to fulfil the conditions of the promised indulgences ; and thus it becomes a book of reference which will be of general utility. Besides this, the work contains a great many indulgenced prayers, and beautiful hymns, which have been selected with as much judgment, as true devotional feeling.

XXXII.—*The Life of St. Frances of Rome.* By Lady GEORGIANA FULLERTON. Of Blessed Lucy of Narni, of Dominica of Paradiso, and of Anne de Montmorency; with an Introductory Essay by J. M. Capes, Esq. London : Burns and Lambert, 1855.

The public are indebted to Lady Georgiana Fullerton, for the life of St. Frances of Rome, taken from the lives in the Bollandist collection, and other authentic sources of information ; this abridgment is written with spirit and fervour as well as elegance. The life of this great saint, the foundress of the religious order of the Oblates of Fondi Specchi, is one of those that are not only glorious and instructive, but also attractive to the heart ; like that of St. Elizabeth of Hungary, to whom in many circumstances she bears a resemblance. St. Frances was a Roman saint ; lived and died in the Holy City, and was an omen of peace and consolation to its citizens, during those times of trouble when the Popes had withdrawn themselves to Avignon, and perpetual conflicts gave Rome the aspect of a battle-field ; when her nobles shed blood in her streets ; and heresy, schism, and conflicts, within and without, desolated the Church. St. Frances had her own share of the romance, and the terror, and the strange reverses of those times ; but in her home and domestic affections all was peace. She was a dutiful daughter, a kind faithful wife, a loving mother ; nor did she fear to fill her heart yet fuller of human love, by a succession of intimate and tender friendships. Divine mercy blessed to her these sweet affections ; and to her was vouchsafed a vision to which we remember no parallel ; she was permitted to behold her little son after his death, to see him in his heavenly form ; and the tidings that she must resign another of her children were conveyed to her by his lips, in the same breath with which he told her of the unspeakable happiness of heaven.

Wonderful is the diversity of God's dealing with His

saints ; the life of Blessed Lucy of Narni was filled with violent contrasts. Devoted to the life of a cloister, she was led by divine grace to a married state ; almost breaking, by her desertion, the heart of her husband who loved her, she was permitted, perhaps by means of this very trial, to bring him to a state of holiness. The world, contrary to its wont, discerning her sanctity, raised her to the highest point of glorification. Suddenly she was cast down, accused of imposture, loaded with ignominy, at once persecuted and neglected ; and after eight and thirty years of utter abjection, left to die in solitude ; in solitude from men, while the saints of heaven tended her lowly couch. These two venerable women were of noble birth, but the Blessed Dominica was a peasant's child, and her sanctity grew, as does the flower by the way side, nourished only by the dews of heaven. There is a simple sweetness in the details of her life and labours, which adds something of a new perfume, a new splendour to the glorious variety of the elect children of God. We need scarcely say that Mr. Capes' introduction adds great value to the work. There could be nothing more acute, more logical, or more complete ; and we wish we could hope that every line of it might be read by those Protestants, or "weak Catholics," whose shallow objections cause them to stumble on the threshold of that vestibule of heaven, to which a study of the "lives of the Saints" would introduce them.

XXXIII.—*Acts of the Early Martyrs.* By MRS. HOPE. Written for the Oratorian Schools of Our Lady of Compassion. Duffy. Dublin. 1855.

An admirable book of the kind, and for its special purpose. Written for children, the style is simple, clear, and grave. All details needful for the better understanding the narrative, are given, with the obvious pious comments suggested by it ; yet the story is not overladen by one or the other ; but told as children like a story to be told, with simple precision and earnestness. This book will be to children of all classes, a real treasure of spiritual instruction as well as of entertainment.

XXXIV.—*The Poetry of Creation.* By Nicholas Mitchell, Author of “Ruins of Many Lands,” &c. London, Chapman and Hall, 1855.

One of the noblest and most genuine poems of the present day is, the “Ruins of Many Lands.” It is exalted in sentiment, and highly finished in execution; it contains few lines which might not be subjected to the most critical analysis of meaning, grammar, and rhyme,—and this correctness, so essential to the satisfaction of every reader of judgment, has not subdued the play of a most elegant and poetic fancy. It abounds in passages of exquisite beauty, that need no trickery or meretricious ornament to please the imagination; if the Author has less of the true poetic fire than belongs to our great Catholic poet, Mr. Aubrey de Vere, we must allow for the difficulties overcome, and that his high place is merited, by the sustained and comprehensive plan of his poem. We congratulate our readers upon another poem, by Mr. Mitchell, which is in no respect inferior to its predecessor, and which we purpose to make known to our readers. The marvels of Creation are introduced in these noble verses:

“The worlds were not : in region far,
Beyond where glorious sun and star
Rose afterwards, to spangle o'er
With diamond points Heaven's turquoise floor,
Sat throned the Eternal ; round, below,
Circle and circle, row on row,
The angelic bands were blazing bright ;
Till lessening on the straining sight,
They looked but brilliant sparks, which strewed
The paths of dim infinitude.
The dulcet notes that melted round,
From harp and lip, and filled the abyss,
Seemed burning feeling turned to sound,
The outgushing of ecstatic bliss ;
Music full, deep, yet soft as sighs,
And pure as those ne'er sullied skies ;
Ether through all its depths was stirred ;
Such music mortals never heard ;
Harmonious the tuned mighty choir,
Upswelled the tones, like waves of fire,
As all the host were one vast lyre !

“O uncreate ! the mind flies back
Through vistas of a million years,
And droops, and faints upon the track,
Yet still one spirit—God appears ;
No space without Him—no before ;
The sea of ages hath no shore.
Unchanging beams His glory's ray,
Ne'er lit, as ne'er to fade away—
A fire, its essence hidden deep
In its dread self, that still must keep
Its holy splendour, burning through
The gone, the now, the future, too.
Dream, if thou canst, when o'er the vast
No great, creative Spirit passed,
No life, no God ; then how could rise
From nought the Monarch of the skies ?
Who the first mover ?—bow, revere,
Weep adoration's trembling tear ;
The finite mind must vainly climb
To reach some thoughts, too dread, sublime :
Enough to own, to feel, that God
Knew no beginning ; Heaven was He ;
Himself yon azure ever trod,
Himself the past eternity !”

“As there excess of glory veiled
The brow before which all things paled,
From out His throne there flashed a light,
Soft as His love, yet richly bright :
No sun now throws such wondrous rays,
Did melted opals form that blaze ?
Each shaft of beams seemed glowing heat,
Archangel's vision dared not meet ;
And through the void they sped like thought,
A million million miles away ;
With virtue, awful beauty fraught,
Heaven's unimaginable day !
The seraphim that hovered round,
Hushed their sweet harps' entrancing sound,
And drew their wings before each face,
Dazzled, though high their favoured race :
And as their snowy plumes lay twining,
That holy light upon them shining,
They looked like foam along the sea,
Of outspread, blue immensity,”

The author takes that view of creation which the discoveries of science have now rendered familiar.

“Ages roll on, deep, solemn, slow,
Breaking on matter’s wide spread shore,
Each sphere God’s Spirit watches o’er ;
But oh! no human joy or care,
As yet exults, or melts below.”—p. 17.

At length angelic beings come upon the scene ; Satan appears ; he could but wear the aspect, and play the part which Milton has given him, himself deriving them from Holy Scripture ; but here our Poet’s pencil falters ; though his sketch is fine ;—for Milton only durst handle this terrible conception with a master’s grasp. To shrink not from its terror and its hideousness, but to evoke from them sublimity, to give substance and form, and life and power, and make of this ethereal being a strong reality ;—these demanded a genius of stronger grasp than we have met, or ever may meet with again. In the creation of our first parents, there is originality, and we think it will bear any comparison. After a lovely apostrophe to the beauty of the material world, the poet writes :

“Was it the waking wind’s low sigh ?
Or rush of spirits gliding by ?
Or came from Nature’s heart that sound,
The air, each frail leaf trembling round ?
See ! what quick light is flashing now,
And spreading soft o’er Eden’s bowers !
It halos every mount’s green brow,
And bathes in radiance trees and flowers ;
It pierces groves late veiled in shade,
Each stream to fretted silver turns ;
Splendour is like a garment laid
On Eden, thus a glory made :
Yet all is beauteous, while it burns.
The sun pours no such dazzling day,
’Tis purer, richer, than his ray.
A trembling creeps each spirit o’er ;
They bow—the mighty they adore :
The awful, throned One of the sky,
The unapproachable, unseen,
Who grasps, and fills immensity,
Who shall be, and hath ever been,

Regards with pleasure this small sphere,
And deigns to' unfold his mercy here ;
The light illuming Eden's sod
Flows from the radiant smile of God.

“ Not gradual fashioned, limb by limb,
Not rising slow, in shadows dim,
But quick as eye can ope its lid,
And dart its brightness through the lashes ;
Suddenly, as some stream, late hid
By foliage, into sunshine dashes ;
Light as a thought, or prayer's soft sigh,
Born in the heart, leaps up the sky ;
Swift as the lightning's soul goes by ;
Man from the dust of Eden sprung,
Perfect at once, mature though young ;
The hand that formed—the mighty word
That spoke to life—unseen, unheard ;
For highest cherubs durst not raise
Their brows upon the August to gaze,
E'en *they* would sink beneath the blaze—
But there stood man, revealed to view,
Fresh as the life-fraught air he drew,
Each limb instinct with living flame,
With strength was pillared in his frame.
Not glittering, wing'd, like angels, seen,
Yet noble was his form, his mien
Breathed tranquil majesty and grace,
Mind lighting, like a sun, his face:
Dominion sat upon his brow
A thing to which the world would bow !

“ Oh ! what a rush of feelings came
Full on his heart, and shook his frame,
As first his eye took in the light,
Took in the colours shining round,
Took in the aërial forms so bright,
The lake's smooth glass, the tree-crowned height,
The flowers that painted Eden's ground !
Amazement swelled his heart—he turned,
And gazed, and gazed, and still he burned
To feel life's lux'ry, and inhale
The spirit of the ambrosial gale.
Whence came--what was he ? nought he knew,
Yet up instinctively he threw
His glance to Heaven's deep holy blue.

Yes, though untold, he felt the tie
Between him and the solemn sky ;
E'en as the rudest of his race
Looks up, and thinks his maker dwells
Somewhere in that abyss of space—
A faith nor years, nor crimes efface,
And a proud destiny it tells.

...

“ He slept—dark mystery—angels never
Yield to that death-like, hushed repose,
Which nerves our frames, and balms our woes,
Yet seems the while from life to sever :
Their eyes no toil, no cares, oppress,
Bright in eternal wakefulness ;
And much each marvels, as he sees
The spirit of a curtained dream
Disturb those features, like the breeze
Ruffles the blue of Eden's stream—
He wakes—what sound so soft, so dear,
Yet strangely sweet, enchants his ear ?
Do winds above him kiss the palm ?
Each leaf is stirless 'mid the calm :
Murmurs the brook its evening hymn ?
It spreads like glass, and each frail flower
Hangs, as in marble, o'er the brim ;
The bird too, slumbers in his bower.
Again that sigh—the forms so fair
Sate by his side, no more are there ;
Along the slanting golden beam,
Their wings reflecting each rich gleam,
He sees them gliding far away,
Departing with departing day.

“ She knelt upon the flowery ground,
A dream dissolving beauty round,
Her head thrown back, and raised her eyes,
Fixed on the glowing twilight skies ;
Her wild free locks, so black and bright,
O'er glossy shoulders waving, streaming,
Like a full cascade thrown at night
Down a fair rock, in moonshine gleaming—
Tresses, whose rich abundance, too,
Covered the flowers that near her blew.
Her hands—devotion's earliest sign,
Such meekness, from the first, divine—

Crossed on the marble of her breast,
Where purity, each feeling blest,
Lodged, vested like, a hallowed guest.
Her lifted brow, so smooth and fair—
Did snowdrops spread their essence there?
Her eye, whence flowed such lustre streams,
As if 'twere formed alone of beams,
Plainly, as some clear brook discloses
Each pebble that beneath reposes,
Showed what sweet thoughts upon her stole,
All, all that glowed within her soul.

“ She knelt—what else could woman do,
Adoring, to her nature true,
Some unknown Power, who thus could bless,
And call her up from nothingness ?
Man might to sterner impulse yield,
And, dazzled, tread thought's widest field ;
But she took woman's gentle part,
A thing all gratitude, all heart,
And thus, by holiest instinct swayed
Dropped on her trembling knees, and prayed.

“ Oh beautiful and touching sight,
The first-born woman rapt in prayer,
Midst evening's soft and golden light,
And all things sweet—herself more fair ;
To Heaven and God, though great the height,
The sighing murmurs rise through air,
With feeling's tears, her dark eyes swim,
And now they watch the sun's red rim
As slow he bows behind yon steep,
And leaves the world to calm and sleep.
Oh ! since that prayer, what countless sighs
Hath woman's lips sent up the skies !
And though a shade hath fallen now
From sin upon her soul and brow,
And erring passions oft assail,
Yet truth, faith, love, in each meek tone,
Her heart's beseechings ne'er shall fail
To reach the Eternal's awful throne.

“ Upstarting from his bed of leaves,
Awakened man that form perceives,
The lovely one, who lit his dreams,
Before him real, breathing, shining

Her gentle beauty shedding beams,
More bright for darkening day's declining.
Drawn by sweet spells, he seeks her side,
And wondering looks—that thing so fair
Is no winged habitant of air,
Her nature to his own allied.
As beautiful she seems as they,
Who make the clouds their radiant way,
But less ethereal, with more bloom,
And ho! beyond e'en glittering plume,
Waves that redundant wealth of tresses,
And the soul-glancing eye expresses
Something more gentle, and more dear,
Than doth in angel eyes appear ;
Something less stately, proud, and high,
But fraught with deeper witchery ;
Its ray, though timid, like a dart
That melts into the conquered heart."—p. 48.

This adoring vestal we can far more readily accept as the type of our common mother than the Eve of Milton, who, however veiled in loveliness, is a sensual and unchristian representation of woman, not before, but since her fall.

From Paradise the author passes to the present time, and vindicates the imperishable beauty of God's creation ; mountains and vales, the desert and the ocean, lakes, rivers, are each described so beautifully, that we scarcely know what to choose for selection. There is an impetuosity and force in the following lines, which make them a good specimen of the Poet's power of illustrating nature.

"How the black clouds roll up in masses,
Like toppling towers, or mountain-passes ;
Their centres of an inky hue,
No sunlight seen their volume through ;
But to thin flame their edges turning,
And every instant hotter burning.
Hushed are the earth, the air ; and fear
Creeps upon all things far and near,
The flocks group closely on the lea,
The leaf hangs moveless from the tree ;
The brook in shadow steals along,
Each bird hath ceased his jocund song ;
Valleys and hills seem waiting round :
A something sighs along the ground,
And still the gloom grows more profound.

"A sudden gleam in yonder cloud—
As passion from some o'erwrought soul
Breaks forth, despite the will's control,
The pent-up lightning rends its shroud ;
In zigzag lines it darts through air ;
The hills red, quivering halos wear,
Beneath the intolerable flashing ;
And now the stricken pine is crashing.
Along the river runs the fire,
And as the electric bolts expire,
Others in nearer clouds are born.
The deep forewarning hush is o'er,
The thunder rolls along heaven's floor,
And terror listens roar on roar.
It seems Death's pale horse trod the sky,
And while he sweeps careering by,
The fiends exulting raise a shout,
Till mountains quake, and vales ring out.
The herd for shelter seeks the wood,
And in that leaf-closed solitude,
The bird hath slunk into its nest,
But there to tremble,—not to rest.
And still through skies that redly glow,
Hoarsely the living thunders rattle,
Like Heaven's artillery set in battle ;
Then through the hills they echo low,
Like torture's wail, or voice of woe.
But rain-drops now, big, slow, at first,
By Nature's grief and anguish nursed,
Fall one by one, down pattering loud,
Till stream, from each o'erburdened cloud,
Bright torrents, as to deluge earth ;
The storm that sprang to sudden birth,
And filled Creation's heart with fears,
Ending with these repentant tears.
Yes, the black storm, a scourge that seemed,
Hath sunk, a giant tired, to rest."—p. 84.

The softer scenes of lake and valley are charmingly sketched ; but further quotations must be needless. It is not merely the external face of nature that the author touches upon ; life, from the wonderful vegetation of a flower, to the complicated frame of man, is passed in rapid review. We admire in this part of the work, not only the quantity of matter contained in so small a volume, but the skill shown in its arrangement ; in the selection of the different phenomena, as well as in the brightness and

brilliancy with which they are treated. As for instance, that of the human heart :

“ Hark to that faint and gentle beating !
A child into the world is born ;
Time fleets, and Life is still repeating
The sign at noon it gave at morn.
The night of Age now gathers round,
And still that pulsing thing is found,
Beating the seconds, like a wand
In some musician’s skiful hand,
Which seems to govern and preside,
And urge bright harmony’s full tide.
Impell’d by unseen vital fire,
Millions of strokes shall fail to tire
The wondrous organ in man’s breast ;
His frame may sleep—that must not rest,
But ceaseless work, and ceaseless sound,
Ixion’s wheel, quick-flying round.
Not doomed more restless, save that here
All is calm ease, not toil or fear ;
Such the divine Machinist’s skill,
He whose great hand doth nothing ill.
Yet know, each stroke the heart doth give,
Comes from His high permissive power ;
He says—Heart ! beat ! and mortal live,
Smiling through life’s glad reckless hour ;
He says—Heart ! cease ! and darkness falls
Where all till now was joy and light ;
And the soul leaves her late gay halls,
To unlamped gloom, and voiceless night.”—p. 139.

We could multiply such extracts ; nor are they mere gems upon the surface, but perfectly in harmony with the general style of the poem, in which there is scarcely a faulty or inelegant line ; but when the poet, in conclusion, passes from physical to moral creation, his philosophy becomes too vague to be impressive ; the subject is too vast, too complicated, to be thus approached ; and he has no clue to the terrible enigmas that surround him ; something of feebleness, therefore, becomes manifest, through the benevolence of feeling and beauty of diction which he never loses.

XXXV.—*Hours at the Altar ; or Meditations on the Holy Eucharist.* From the French of M. L'Abbe de la BONILLERIE, Vicar-General of Paris. Edited by Ed. CASWALL, Priest of the Oratory of St. Phillip Neri. Dublin : Duffy, 1855.

Of devotions to the Blessed Sacrament we have abundance, many of them more beautiful than these, in our opinion. Yet there is something so blessed in the origin of these meditations, that Mr. Caswall has surely judged rightly that there must be a blessing in the use of them. The Abbé de la Bonillerie had the happy idea of founding an association for the special object of adoring the Blessed Sacrament during the night; the associates engaging themselves to consecrate one hour of the night monthly to this devout exercise; but privately as it were, spiritually, in the solitude of their own rooms. From this nocturnal adoration he next proceeded to obtain the perpetual exposition daily, in one of thirty churches of Paris; other pious duties sprang from this first fervent purpose of adoration of the Blessed Sacrament; and these meditations were given by the pious founder of the association to promote the devotion of its associates. We need only add, that in the course of a very few years, they have reached in France as many as twelve editions.

XXXVI.—1. *An Examination of the Rev. R. J. Wilberforce's Charges against the Church of England.* (Reprinted from the *Christian Remembrancer*.) London: Mozley, 1855.

2.—*Some Letters to the Editor of the Weekly Register, in Reply to the Rev. F. MEYRICK's Article on Church Authority.* By ROBERT ISAAC WILBERFORCE. London: Burns and Lambert, 1855.

The above controversy has arisen out of Mr. Wilberforce's publication, on occasion of his secession from the Church of England—the “Inquiry into the principles of Church Authority.”

To several of the topics in that Inquiry, the further elucidations elicited by Mr. Meyrick's strictures in the “*Christian Remembrancer*,” form a most interesting supplement; and our readers will agree that the learning, the candour, and above all, the forbearing courtesy of Mr. Wilberforce have never appeared to greater advantage than in the above reply.

XXXVII.—*The Origin and Development of Anglicanism : or, a History of the Liturgies, Homilies, Articles, Bibles, Principles and Governmental System of the Church of England.* By the Rev. W. WATERWORTH, S.J. London : Burns and Lambert. 1854.

This learned and important work, has left the Church of England;—as a church,—no ground to stand upon. The Reverend author is perfectly familiar with every circumstance of her origin and progress, and the whole theory of her government: he has brought these facts to bear one upon another with peculiar aptness; his logic is faultless, and his style has a rough vigour which reminds us of Cobbett; he possesses that power which natural humour, and a perfect mastery over his subject naturally give. Need we say how gladly we should see such a work in universal circulation? Alas, we are reminded of Shylock,—“Till thou canst rail the seal from off my bond.” The Church of England rests secure upon her broad lands, and under the broader shelter of Church Patronage: but can this be so always?

XXXVIII.—*The Christian Virtues and the Means of obtaining them.* By St. ALPHONSUS MARIA DE LIGUORI. Newly translated from the Italian and edited by Robert A. Coffin, Priest of the Most Holy Redeemer. London : Burns and Lambert. 1854.

The Theological works of St. Liguori, are now so widely known in England and so justly appreciated by Catholics, that we have only to express gratitude to the Revd. translator for this addition to the number of those which are accessible to the English reader. The present treatise appears to us eminently practical; simple, somewhat austere in style, exceedingly FULL, exceedingly suggestive.

XXXIX.—*Enquiry whether Salvation can be had without true Faith.* By the RIGHT REV. GEORGE HAY. London, Dublin, and Derby : Richardson and Son. 1855.

An excellent reprint of Dr. Hay's well known valuable Treatise.

XL.—1. *The Witch of Melton Hill*. A Tale, by the Author of "Mount St. Lawrence." (Popular Library.) London: Burns and Lambert. 1855.

2. *Pictures of Christian Heroism*. With Preface by the Rev. H. E. Manning, D.D. (Popular Library.) London: Burns and Lambert. 1855.

We are very happy to register the appearance of two further volumes of this most promising series; each excellent after its kind. *The Witch of Melton Hill*, is an interesting and forcibly written tale; with just as much of serious truth in it as a light book of fiction can safely carry. The "Pictures of Christian Heroism" has the true and more lasting interest of reality to insure its popularity. The story of Margaret Clitherow, of Mother Macrina of Minsk, and of a Confessor of the Faith during the French Revolution, are of a class, the interest of which can never pall upon a truly Catholic heart.

XLI.—*History of the Catholic Missions among the Indian Tribes of the United States, 1529-1854*. By JOHN G. SHEA. New York: Dunigan. 1855.

The story of these missions may well be regarded as the Romance of Church History; and Mr. Shea has done full justice to the interest with which it is pregnant. His work is the result of ten years' laborious collection and research, and contains many particulars never before made public. It will take its place, in every Catholic library, by the side of the *Lettres Edifiantes* and their modern continuation.

XLII.—*A Monograph on Mental Unsoundness*. By FRANCIS WHARTON. Philadelphia: Kay and Brother, 1855.

A few lines of advertisement inform us that this is but the first book in a *Treatise on Medical Jurisprudence*, about to be published by Mr. Wharton, in connection with Dr. Moreton Stillé of Philadelphia. There can be no doubt of the value of such a work when completed, if we may judge by that portion of it which we have now before us. This Monograph is, in itself, a complete treatise upon insanity, learned, laborious, and filled with the opinions and

experiences of the most eminent medical men of all nations, German, French, English, and American. It cannot, however, be considered as a Medical Work, as it contains no directions for the medical, but rather for the legal treatment of the disease. The work is divided into two heads, or chapters: the first, upon "Mental Unsoundness, in its legal relations;" the second, upon "Mental Unsoundness, considered Psychologically." Under this last head are described every phase, every symptom, every modification of this dreadful malady; terrible indeed is the array, and terrible to think how few there are of these idiosyncracies, which have not at one time or another crossed our paths; and we speak the experience of most men of the world. For it is not as Physicians we are commenting upon this treatise; to them it will afford matter for much deeper study. The main object and point of this work is the degree of irresponsibility, legal and moral,—chiefly the former, which attaches to "Mental Unsoundness;" and we confess that we are startled by the conclusions of the author. There is scarcely a sin committed which might not claim exemption from punishment under one or other of Mr. Wharton's definitions of irresponsibility. True, he urges the seclusion of the offenders, both for their own sakes and that of society, and makes many pertinent observations upon the kind of restraint needful, the difficulties thrown in the way of their classification, and so on; but it is a serious question, whether confinement on the ground of lunacy is adequate for either of these purposes. Whether or not, this change of punishment is a boon to the wretched sufferer so respited, it is hard to say; it is not so, we fear, without more effective spiritual appliances than dreamed of in the Protestant world; but it is certain that, upon society in general, it has a most pernicious effect, confusing men's notions, offering to every disordered imagination a ready excuse for its own promptings, and at the same time a loophole for escaping punishment; investing crime with a veil of mystery, which leaves it doubtful whether it is not a more fitting object of pity than indignation, and planting a deep sense of injustice in the hearts of criminals, who, tossed in the tempest of tribulation and passion, have indeed as good an excuse of "irresponsibility" as many of those who have fostered in themselves "Mental Unsoundness," by the indulgence of propensities of which they know the guilt,

and know also the danger ; as they generally shew by trying to conceal their actions. Mr. Wharton quotes Pinel for the assertion, " that there are madmen in whom there is no perceptible alteration of the intellectual process, of the perceptions, judging faculty, imagination, or memory ; and yet a perversion of the manifestations of the will, in a blind impulse to the commission of violence, or even of blood thirsty rage, without any assignable dominant idea ; any delusion of the imagination, which could cause such a propensity." (p. 146.) No doubt there are, but we should like to see the distinction laid down between these, and what we have been used to consider as dangerously wicked people ; who at the first overt act took the consequences of their evil dispositions. We apply the same remark to the definition of Pritchard, who describes this "*mania sine delirio*," (that is the proper designation) as " a morbid perversion of the natural feelings, affections, inclinations, tempers, habits, and moral dispositions, without any notable lesion of the intellect, or knowing and reasoning faculties, and particularly without any maniacal hallucination." (p. 148.) Unhappily there are such people, but are not they the very characters for whom the terror of human laws forms the only curb ? and who not only require but understand it well ? And this becomes a most practical question ; for a list is given of every sin which men commit, killing, lying, stealing, incendiarism, so on through the whole catalogue, even to that " deep perversion of the social affections, whereby the feelings of kindness and attachment that flow from the affections of father, husband, and child, are replaced by a perpetual inclination to tease, worry, and embitter the existence of others." (p. 168.) And all these sins, from their most natural form to that of most diabolical wickedness, are given as tendencies at once, and symptoms of " unsoundness of mind" when " morbid ;" that is, when excessive. Heaven forbid we should appear to suggest harshness to those whom God has deprived of reason ; but we certainly think the forbearance accorded to them, may be extended too far over the mysterious perversity of human nature. Under the new name of "*Oikeiomania*," or " morbid state of domestic affections," a strong illustration is given of what we have been remarking. Dr. Mayo says of men, who illuse their wives, " Many men are living in a state of continuous and exhausting remorse, under the consciousness that this

system of torture is being carried on by them. For when once the habit is formed, they can neither shake it off, nor bear their self-consciousness under it." (p. 168.) How many of the "morbid" feelings of the present age in respect to crime are concentrated in this sentence!

Two instances are given of this "Oikeiomania," since that is the name for it; King Frederick of Prussia's brutality to his children, especially be it observed to his heir, which is attributed to "Mental Unsoundness," although it is so well known that the man's mind was sound enough, except where he chose deliberately to, and could safely, indulge his vicious passions to excess. The other instance is that of Zimmerman. "Very often," says the author, "this domestic perversity is associated with the most complacent benignity out of doors. Zimmerman, whilst he was inculcating and professing the most serene benevolence, was by his tyranny driving his son into madness, and making his daughter an outcast from her home." (p. 166.) That is, he had sanity enough to be a consummate hypocrite. We have ourselves known a case of cruelty to a child, where the taint of madness probably lurked in the father, for it certainly was derived from the parents by the child; but it is also noticeable that when the terrors of the French police were brought to bear upon this man, he found himself quite able to control it. "They cannot hang him," was whispered about in the York Lunatic Asylum, when the firing of York Minster, by a supposed lunatic, was under consideration, "he is one of ourselves." It is obvious how dangerous such an opinion might be outside those doors; and really when we see how very frequently "Mental Unsoundness" arises from indulged sin, or wilful folly on the part of the unhappy sufferers, we cannot recognise the justice, any more than the expediency of sacrificing the safety of society to an over scrupulous enquiry into the question of the "irresponsibility" of criminals. We wish this subject could be taken up by those who are qualified to consider it more deeply, and in a religious point of view. In many parts of the monograph, this view of the subject is introduced; allusion is made to the beneficial influence of religion in preventing such disorder, to the freedom of Catholic priests, as a body, from mental unsoundness: the supposed reason being that "they are subject to authority" and to the possibility of demoniacal possession. These interesting subjects are but

touched upon, but Mr. Wharton's observations are distinguished for sound sense and good feeling ; nor do we consider our preceding observations altogether applicable to him. If the German and especially the American authorities whom he quotes, take an over lenient view of human perversity, he himself has a tendency to guard against the danger of their opinions, while his examination of the symptoms of madness, (especially in its incipient stages,) and of the methods for detecting it when simulated, are in the highest degree accurate and valuable.

XLIII.—1. *What I Know of the Late Emperor, Nicholas, and his Family.* By EDWARD TRACY TURNERELLI. London : Churton. 1855.

2. *Is the War Just ?* A Letter to Lord Palmerston. London : Dalton. 1855.

Both these books, in a different way, will, rightly or wrongly, be regarded by the popular prejudice as written in the Russian interest. The Letter to Lord Palmerston is an undisguised apology of the peace. The sketch of the Emperor Nicholas and his Family is a panegyric of the high personal qualities for which the writer gives them credit. We have no desire, however, to join in this indiscriminating habit of attributing such motives to all who have the courage to think for themselves in a crisis in which all have an equal interest, and an equal right to their own opinion. Some of Mr. Turnerelli's anecdotes and sketches are interesting, even though they tell favourably to the Emperor of Russia ; and he would be unwise who would allow his prejudices to stand in the way of the enjoyment of reading this little book. The Letter to Lord Palmerston is learned but somewhat dull.

INDEX TO VOL. XXXIX.

Abel, Dr. Donaldson's theories concerning, 229.
Adalbert, Archbishop of Brevain, 7.
Adrian, Pope, 42.
Affre, Monseigneur, enforces sacred eloquence, 443—extract from his pastoral, 458.
Alexander, Pope, excommunicated the councillors of Henry IV., 7.
Audin, his account of the labours of the monks, 16.
Arabia, Geography of, 81.
Arts the, state of in England, 330—flourished under the care of the Church, 331.
Athanasius, St., concerning Sabellianism, 409.
Augustine, St., concerning preaching, 435—M. Hamon's work develops his instructions, 440.
Azeglio, Marquis de, maintains the right to violate the Concordat, 174.
Barbara, the Empress, 12.
Belknap, 359.
Bishops, Catholic, in the reign of Richard II. spoke under compulsion, 365—frequently murdered in the dark ages, 367.
Bohemia, history of, 9—dissensions between and Austria, 9—*ibid.*, 10.
Books, notices of, 272—490.
Boniface VIII., Pope, his licences to the clergy to study, 341.
Boyle, Rev. Mr., history of his dismissal from Islington, 148—of the grounds of his action, 150—supported by Protestants, 153.
Bread, adulteration of, 65.
Breuster, Sir David, his biography of Sir Isaac Newton, 273, 277.
Brief, the, of "Dominus ac Redemptor," 134.
Bunsen, M., his new work of Christianity and Mankind, 387—divided into three parts, *ib.*, his bias against Pope Callistus, 390.
Burton, Mr., his pilgrimage to Meccah and Medinah, 76—original purpose of his journey, 80—preparation for his disguise, 82—obtaining his Turkish passport, 85—his equipment, 86—his practice as a doctor, 88—his pilgrimage, 90—his arrival at Medinah, 93—and life there, 94.
Burnett prize Essays, 483.
Cardinal Wiseman, his Lecture addressed to the St. James's Young Men's Society, 462—on the nature of an inaugural address, 463—what an inaugural address ought not to be, 465—on the one-sided view of history taken by Lord John Russell, 467—facts cited on the Catholic side, 471—remarks on the literature recommended by Lord John Russell, 475.
Cardinal Wiseman, action brought against him, 146—reasons for his letter to the Univers, 150—his justification at the trial, 153—plaintiff's desire to put him in the box, 153—the non-suit set aside, 156—second trial, 157—verdict set aside, 158—third trial, 160—compromised, 161—review of the case, 162.
Callistus, Pope, charge of heresy against him,

389—its eager acceptance, 390—what his opinions were on the Trinity, so far as they can be gathered, 398, 400, 402—in his turn charges Hippolytus with false doctrine, 399—this counter statement kept out of sight by Protestants, *ib.*—charges against him examined, 400—perversions of his meaning, 407.
Caravan of pilgrims, arrival of, 101.
Cavour, Count de, 165.
Cerethi, no proof that they were Cretans, 207.
Chamber of Deputies in the Sardinian states, 167.
Charles V., the Emperor, convenes the Diet of Worms, 39—does not seek to repress heresy, 42—pursues his schemes of aggrandisement, 43—appeals to a general council, *ib.*—assumes all authority in religious affairs, 46—receives the confession of Augsburg, 46—continuation of his career, 49—review of his conduct, 51.
Charles III. of Spain, his treatment of the Jesuits, 127.
Chaucer, his Canterbury Tales, 378—extract from his other poems, 379.
Cherubim, etymology of the word, 221.
Choiseul, Duc de, 121—his letter to the Cardinal de Bernis, 131.
Church, the, hers the glory of rising liberty, 332—its contests with the crown, 333—counselled the Magna Charta, *ib.*—of necessity interferes with temporalities, 335—Charters which exist, proving the Church's struggle for liberty, 337—her grievances identical with those of the people, 347.
Church, Catholic, evils existing in it to be ascribed to secular interference, 3—despoiled and controlled by the civil power, 9—spoliations perpetrated upon her, 46.
Church of England, strains at a gnat and swallows a camel, 201.
 —Catholic in France, her especial need of sacred eloquence, 442—has changed her system in teaching it, *ib.*
Clement XIII., his character, 120—his firm support of the Jesuits, 127.
Clement XIV., circumstances of his election, 127—the conflict and distress he underwent, 129—publishes his Brief, "Dominus ac Redemptor," 134—justice done him by Pere Ravignan, 139.
Clergy, Norman, their superiority in literature, 340—ignorant clergy appointed by the Norman sovereigns, 341—Saxon very ignorant, 342—character of them in Edward III.'s times, 371—their munificence, 372.
Coffes, adulterations of, 72.
Commission, the Devon, 298.
Committee of Ordainers—how composed, 347.
Concordats, obligation on governments to keep them, 176.
Concordat with Austria, 415—gives freedom to the Bishops, 418—and to education, 419—gives to the clergy censorship of the press, 421—authority in marriages, 422—to the Bishops

- power of ecclesiastical censures, 423—concessions of the Church concerning temporalities, 424—right of sanctuary and respect for the clergy, 425—episcopal seminaries to be maintained, *ib.*—admits the right of the Pope to form dioceses, and other provisions, the oath of allegiance, 426—regulates the filling up of benefices, 427—error in Protestant translation of, 427—allows liberty for new monastic orders, 429—regulates ecclesiastical property, 430.
- Council of Trent*, assembled, 55, 57.
- Curry power*, 69.
- Dervish The*, 83.
- Dionysius of Alexandria*, 409—a parallel between him and Pope Callistus' case, 421.
- Dollinger*, Dr. 26, 58.
- Donaldson*, Dr., 202—danger of the work he has published 203—analysis of the work, 205—his evidences of what ought to constitute any fragment as part of the Book 'Jasher,' 210—divides the Book of Genesis into two fragments, 215—his history of the fall, which he interprets as a myth, 217—his opinions of evil spirits, 218—reproves St. Paul, *ib.*—his definition of the 'Prince of this world,' 219—of the personal holiness of our Lord, 220—his ideas of the holy angels, 221—his denial of their existence affects the relations of the New Testament, 224—his notions of Scripture Genealogy, 227—his views of the Deluge, 232—denies that Christ recognized sacrifices, 234—his falsification of Scripture, 235, 238, 241—his comments on the books of the New Testament, 242—his definition of the inspiration of the Scriptures, 242—his letter answering the 'Morning Herald,' 243.
- Economy*, domestic changes in, 60.
- Edward I.*, King, judges first shew jealousy of the papal provisions, 344.
- Edward the Confessor*, king, his laws, 334.
- Edward II.*, King, swears to observe the laws of the Confessor, 346—intercedes with the Pope for his favourite, *ib.*—his jealousy of the Pope, 348—atrocities of his age, 349—his appointments of bishops, 351.
- Edward III.*, king, his age, 328—popular notions of, 331—his encroachments upon the Church, 337—conclusion of his career, 352—statute of provisors, 343—painful circumstances of his accession, 353—his policy at home and abroad, *ib.*—curious case occurring in his reign, 356—statute of provisors of benefices, 357—case under it, 358, 362, 363.
- Elector of Saxony* refuses to receive Tetzels, 30, 31, 34, 35.
- Eloquence*, Sacred, treatises upon, 433—instructions given in it in Catholic colleges, 440—study of, how far necessary or practicable in Ireland, 449—course of instruction in it pursued at Mechlin, 450—proposed system for acquiring it at colleges, 453—natural eloquence of the Irish clergy, 460.
- Ely*, Bishop of, 366.
- Emperors*, German, owed their title to the Popes, 5.
- Emperor of Austria* has given freedom to the Church, 418, 432.
- Food*, investigation of different articles, 63.
- Franconi*, Archbishop of Turin, 169.
- Frankenberg*, Cardinal de, 420.
- Friars*, Franciscan, 372—instances of their learning, 373.
- Galileo*, treatment of him by the Inquisition, 278.
- Gascoigne*, Chief Justice, heroism in braving the king's wrath rather than try Archbishop Scrope, under Henry IV., 367.
- Genesis*, book of, different theories for dividing it, 215.
- Girls*, no reformatory Catholic school for them, 321.
- Gosselin*, his testimony in favour of the Holy Sec, 3, 5, 6, 8.
- Guelphs* and Ghibellines, origin of the parties, 8.
- Hamon*, M. his treatise on preaching, 434—comparison between it and the instructions of St. Augustine, 435—analysis of his work, 444—given subjects for sermons, 447—rules for the construction of a sermon, *ib.*
- Hassall*, Dr., his investigations upon food, 62.
- Henry IV.*, king of England, his murder of Archbishop Scrope, 367.
- Henry IV.* of Germany, his character, 6.
- Hippolytus*, opinions ascribed to him by Bunsen, 392—an opponent of the Monarchian heresy, 395—his first charge against Callistus one of duplicity, *ib.*—secondly, charges him with heresy concerning the Trinity, 396—admits that Callistus carries with him the great body of the Church, 398—himself liable to the charge of heresy, 404—imputes to him two opposite errors, 406.
- Huss*, John, 10.
- Indulgences*, sale of, reason why all heretics commenced by an attack upon them, 11—proclamation of the sale of them by Leo, 27.
- Ireland*, uncultivated land in, 296.
- Irish* the, their extermination often attempted, 290—their emigration, 292—results of it in America, 293—where they would be best located, 294—no real necessity for their emigrating, 296—their numbers formerly much greater, 296.
- Italy*, nearly all belonged to the Popes, 5.
- Jansenism*, 117, 238.
- Jasher*, Book of, meaning of the title, 203—Dr. Donaldson ascribes the authorship to Solomon, 206—only valid argument for this theory, 212—his supposed contents of the second part, 226—third part, 233—fourth part, 234—fifth part, sixth section, 240.
- Jeffrey*, 253.
- Jesuits*, the, 114—league against them, *ib.*—their sufferings in Portugal, 123—persecution of them in France, 124—their banishment, 125—intrigues against them at Rome, 130—their conduct after the brief dispersing the society, 135—charge brought against them of decline in learning, 142—its refutation, *ib.*—their present condition and increase, 145.
- Job*, book of, 213—on what account unnoticed in Dr. Donaldson's work, 214.
- Joseph II.* Emperor, 413—system which he established, 415—perverted the education of the clergy, 420.
- Judges*, the, their animosity to the Church, 344—subservient to the Crown, 354.
- Julius II.* Pope, 21.
- Kay*, Mr. his book, 303.
- Kings*, Norman, their jealousy of the foreign abbots, 343.
- Kybe*, a, violence done by Dr. Donaldson to this word, 217.

Land, area of, in Ireland, 267—how disposed of, *ib.*—great advantage of reclaiming what is now waste, 301—is being turned from tillage, 304—lands waste in Ireland, the reclaiming them should be taken from the Landlords, 302—authorities for this, *ib.*

Landlords, Irish, 302.

Langham, Archbishop, 350.

Lancaster, Thomas Earl of, consequence of his murder, 348.

Langland, our earliest English poet, 373, 375.

Langton, Bishop, 345, 349.

Langton, John, 346.

Level, the Bedford, system of, 308.

Leo, Pope, cites Luther to Rome, 37—his efforts to put a stop to the heresy, 38—publication of his bull against Luther, 39.

Lingard, Dr. 328—his history of Edward II.'s reign, 347—false summary of his character, 351—errors, 360, 363.

Libel, law of, 158.

Literature, English, how much owing to the Catholic Church, 374.

Locke, his letters on toleration, 475.

Louis XV. King of France, his treatment of the Jesuits, 123.

Luther, followed the footsteps of Huss, 12—why he was 'needed,' 15—his character, 21—his impressions of Rome, *ib.*—erroneous views of Dr. Dollinger concerning him, 26—the motives for the 'propositions' with which he attacked Tetzel, 30—his ruffianly language and artful policy, 33—his extreme caution, 39, 40—his reward in emancipation from his vows, 41—establishes his new religion in Saxony, 51—his character, 59.

Martin, V. Pope, 12—character of the reforms he effected, 13.

Marriage, different views entertained of it in England and Sardinia, 186.

Maximilian, the Emperor, 24—his encouragement of Luther, 36—his hypocritical letter to the Pope, 38.

Maynard, the Abbé, upon Jesuit teaching, 142.

Mecca, 76.

Medinah 76—meaning of the name, 82—its holy places, 95—number of pilgrims to it, 101—character of its people, 105—their manners, 106.

Milton, his views on toleration, 476—on prelacy, 479.

Mohammed, tomb of, 96, 100.

Monino, ambassador of Spain to the Pope, 133.

Monks, the, their translations of Scriptures, 19.

Monasteries, destruction of, in Germany, 48.

Mustard, adulteration of, 63.

Newton, Sir Isaac, 275—entertained Unitarian opinions, *ib.*—whether he was insane at any time, 276, 282—his controversy with Flamsteed, 279—fluxionary controversy, 280—his character, 284, 289—comparison of, with Bacon, 285.

Noctus of Smyrna, leader of the Monarchian School, 394.

Normans, the, 343.

Ottocar, of Bohemia, 9.

Paul IV., Pope, commences a reform in the Church 53, 54—is involved in contest with the Emperor, 54.

Pepper, 69.

Persians, the, unpopular in the East, 87—at the tomb of the prophet, 103.

Philosophumena, its publication, 384.

Pius IV., Pope, continues the Church reforms, 55—reassembles the Council of Trent, 55.

Pius IX., his letters to King Victor Emmanuel, explaining his refusal to dismiss the Sardinian bishops, 172—his allocution on the affairs of Sardinia, 184—opens negotiations and makes concessions, 185.

Pickles, adulteration of, 66.

Platt, Mr. Baron, anecdote of, 156—his behaviour on Cardinal Wiseman's trial, 157.

Placet attached by sovereigns to a Bull of the Pope, 417—when applied, *ib.*—evils of the system, *ib.*

Popes, the, universally in the right in their contests with secular princes, 3—testimony to this fact of Protestant historians, 4—efforts to reform abuses, 18, 25—have always held the Catholic medium in doctrines, 412.

— mixed character universally recognised in them, 176—efforts of the secular powers to wrest from them the patronage of the Church, 340.

Politics, general aspect of, at Luther's coming, 14.

Pollock, Sir Frederick, 155.

Pombal, his character and enmity to the Jesuits, 114—the horrors of his administration, 122.

Protestantism established in Germany, 50—does not thrive in the Sardinian States, 166.

Queens of Sardinia—their deaths, 195.

Ranke, his history of the Popes, 3, 8, 13, 15, 42, 44, 47, 52, 58.

Ravignan, Père de, his times of Clement XIII. and XIV., 110—extract describing the sufferings of the Jesuits, 136.

Rattazzi, colleague of Cavour, 166.

Reformation, the Protestant, in what degree justified by abuses in the Church, 1—true character of, 8—its progress in Germany, 11, 49—its only object spoliation, 47—triumphs at the third Diet of Augsburg, 50.

Religion, state of, at the time of Luther's coming, 15.

Richard II., king, passed a statute directed against the Holy See 365—anecdote of his times, 366.

Russell, Lord John, his Lecture on the Obstacles which have retarded Moral and Political Progress, 466—his one-sided view of history, 467—literature recommended by him, 475.

Sabellius, chief of the Monarchian heresy, 395.

Sacrifices of the Old Law, recognized by Christ, 235.

Sardinian States, religious condition of, 165—mode of packing the chambers, 167—ministers oppose the Church, in order to keep their places, 169—spread of secret societies, *ib.*

Sardinian government, intrigued against the Pope during his exile, 170—stratagems used, 171—commit violence against the Archbishop of Cagliari, 173—propose the Siccardi law, *ib.*—persecute the Archbishop of Turin, 179, 183—persecute the priest who obeyed his orders, 181—sends illusory missions to Rome, 183—pass a law to abolish tithes, 184—further aggressions, 186—demand to reform the temporal property of the clergy, 190—bill for the suppression of monastic orders, 191—acts of spoliation, 190—introduce the convents' bill, 193—what advantage is gained by all these proceedings, 197.

Santa Rosa, Count, is desired to profess penit-

- tence for passing the Siccardi law, 180—is refused absolution on his refusal, *ib.*
- Science*, as opposed to Scripture, 229—letter in the 'Times' concerning, 231.
- Scripture*, books of, quoted by Christ, 236—the writings of Moses, 239.
- Scrope*, Archbishop, his death, 367—King Henry punished for it, 368.
- Schools*, reformatory, 312—acts establishing them, 314—how they affect Catholics, 315—inducements to promote them, 318—efforts made, 320—reformatory act, two amendments desirable in, 322—mode of employment in, 323—schools for innocent children preferable, 324—means for maintaining them, 326.
- See*, the Holy, had no power to prevent the corruptions which are alleged to have arisen in the Church, 4, 7, 371—is blamed at the same time for the existence of abuses, and for its contempts to prevent them, *ib.*—always plundered by secular princes, 13—its exertion to reform abuses rendered powerless by secular patronage, 17—efforts made by its Pontiffs for the reformation of the Church, 53, 54—thwarted by the Spanish prelates, 55—introduces new life into the Church in Germany, 57—is nowhere a foreign power, 177—controlled by English laws, 370—not responsible for mistakes amongst the clergy, 371.
- Shepherd*, the Good, convent of, whether they could undertake a reformatory school for girls, 322.
- Siccardi*, Count, his bill, 173—a violation of five concordats, 179.
- Skimpith*, Judge, 354.
- Smith*, the Rev. Sidney, his parentage, 245—his horse calamity, 246—his career, 248—points of resemblance to Johnson, 250—notions of Scotland, *ib.*—his marriage, 258—got the living of Foxton-le-Clay, 261—anecdotes, *ib.*—exchanges for Combe Florey, 265—of Edmon-ton, 268.
- Spain* offers the most desirable spot for Irish emigration, 295.
- Statute* of provisors of benefices, 357, 359, 360, 369.
- Stratford*, John de, his conduct to king Edward II., 349, 353.
- Ten*, adulterations of, 70.
- Tetzel*, his mode of proclaiming indulgences, 29—his death, 37.
- Theiner*, Fr. his life of Clement XIV., 109, 110, 140—mis-statements, 141.
- Thompson*, Mr., his Essay on Christian Theism, 485.
- Thornton*, Mr., upon the reclamation of waste lands, 307.
- Thoresby*, John, 355.
- Thorpe*, Robert de, 356, 361.
- Trithemius*, 18.
- Trinity*, the, different opinions concerning from the days of Cerinthus, 394.
- Turin*, Archbishop of, proceedings against him, 179—is arbitrarily exiled, 183.
- Ulster*, province of, 300.
- Urban VI.* Pope, 18.
- Van Espen*, Belgian canonist, 420.
- Van Hemel*, M., his *Precis de Rhetorique Sacra*, 449—professor of eloquence at Mechlin, 456—his first course, *ib.*—his second, 451—as pursued at Mechlin, 458—his work sanctioned by the archbishop, 461.
- Visions* of Pierce Plowman, 375—curious prophecy contained in it, 376.
- Voltaire*, 120.
- Waste Lands*, necessity for reclaiming them, 305—authorities for this, *ib.*—what measures should be adopted for this purpose, 308, 309, 310.
- Wenceslaus*, King of Bohemia, 10, 11.
- Winchester*, Bishop of, 355.
- Wickliffe*, 374—his reckless calumnies, 377.
- Wiseman*, Cardinal, action brought against him, 146.



